

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLII No. 8 AUGUST 1957

A PARISH SURVEY

THIS study of a new parish in a northern town is based on nothing more scientific than the conversations between priest and people in the first few months of visiting. Such intimate personal inquiries could not be conducted without feelings being involved on both sides, but it was not difficult to establish the facts before discussing the spiritual problems arising out of them. The author tried to keep an open mind, and the people in these parts are usually frank, not likely to adapt the truth to please the questioner. Moreover, the information was obtained, not from "samples", but from every house in the parish. The article, therefore, should be useful to priests who can compare its contents with their own experience and to students of religious sociology who might want to add it to their documents.

The parish was carved out of a much larger one, long-established and until recently mainly working class. This still has a great hold on the affections of those who have at any time belonged to it. Irish influence has been strong there, the priests mainly coming directly from Ireland and the people more noticeably of Irish stock than is usual even in a diocese where the majority are not more than two generations removed from the old country. In the mother-church those influences reveal themselves in devotion to the Mass and the Rosary and in profound respect for the priest; but there is also a lack of initiative, a tendency to leave everything to the priest and to adopt an attitude of wholly passive obedience, while devotions that are more Italian than Irish flourish side by side with the great essentials.

The new parish provides a more varied pattern. Apart from a moderate-sized hospital, it can most easily be divided into two quite distinct communities. On the one side are mainly the

wealthier Catholics, who are also entirely English or of more remote Irish origins, business and professional men, with a small number of clerks, artisans and labourers. Very few of these are more than a quarter of an hour's easy walking distance from church. We can call this area "G". The other community ("S") is almost exclusively working class, the greater part of it on a housing estate, a small number concentrated in two or three slum streets, and a few scattered among the remaining old but still good houses. The people here also are seldom more than a quarter of an hour's walk from church, but the walking is much more difficult, up one steep hill and down another, sometimes on a mere rocky path. Most of them have been in this district for at least a generation, but they come from different parts of the town and since their arrival here have been uncertain of their allegiance as between three parishes.

The parish does not coincide with the electoral divisions, and it is therefore impossible to establish the proportion of Catholics to non-Catholics in the area surveyed. On the housing estate there are 400 houses and 48 of these are occupied by Catholics, either as householders or as the wives of householders, often with children. On the other side of the parish they are naturally more scattered: streets with no Catholics at all in them, others with only one or two. The proportion here must be less than 5 per cent. The population of the whole town is 97,000 and probably more than 9000 of these are Catholics.

The hospital statistics are best considered apart from the rest. Here at any one time there are fifty to sixty Catholic patients out of a total of about 350, the proportion of Catholics being higher in the maternity wards. Out of a nursing staff of 260 there are about sixty Catholics, all practising, many of them recently from Ireland.

To see the situation in the parish as a whole, at the end of 1956, we can arrange the figures first under the heading of households and then under persons. A household may be a family, a couple or more friends living together, or an individual living alone. "Practising" means that the whole household or its leading members at least attend Mass regularly and fulfil Easter duties; "slack" are those who frequently miss Mass and sometimes Easter duties, but do not wish to lose touch

A PARISH SURVEY

451

with the Church; the "lapsed", if left to themselves, are for the most part unlikely to send for the priest even in danger of death. A different basis of division had to be adopted for those below school-leaving age: although some of these have reached an age at which they are fully responsible, practice largely depends on home conditions and is not directly affected by the school.

HOUSEHOLDS

<i>Practising</i>	<i>Slack</i>	<i>Lapsed</i>	<i>Total</i>
125	25	49	199

PERSONS

	<i>Practising</i>	<i>Slack</i>	<i>Lapsed</i>	<i>Total</i>
Married	151	38	45	234
Over 30, single, widowers or widows	50	13	—	63
Over school age, under 30, unmarried	35	14	20	69
<i>Total</i>	236	65	65	366
	<i>At Catholic Schools</i>	<i>Not at Catholic Schools</i>		
Age-group 5 to 15	42	31		73
	<i>Likely to be brought up as Catholics</i>	<i>Unlikely to be brought up as Catholics</i>		
Baptized, under school age ..	43	2		45
Unbaptized		1
<i>Total</i>		485

The parents of the child unbaptized since last September—both Catholics—explained that they were going to spend Christmas with relatives in another parish and “we’ll have it all done together”.¹ The rest of the figures begin to be more illuminating when they are related to districts or to the type of marriage involved.² Five Catholics have gone through a form of marriage with a divorced person or are themselves divorced; these had to be described as “lapsed”, but at least two of them would gladly return to the practice of their religion if something less than heroism were required to release them from their present commitments. On the whole it looks as if practice is more easily abandoned in mixed marriages, but there is more hope where the wife is a Catholic. That there are greater numbers of slack and lapsed in S is due to a considerable extent to the uprooting and the difficulty of the journey to a strange church.³ The people in G are often newcomers, but they are of a class that is less attached to any one parish and less influenced by neighbours; their way to church is also much easier. Whatever the reason, the proportion of 50 per cent slack or lapsed in the age-group 15 to 30 is a disturbing feature. But there appears to be a return to practice with advancing age: the over-thirties are well over the age at which matrimony is seriously considered or they have already been married, and among these are no lapsed and comparatively few slack.

¹ What else was to be done is still not clear, but the Baptism did take place in the other parish at Christmas.

² “Married” persons are so described if they have gone through any form of marriage, religious or civil.

³ Nearly all of these gave as a reason for their attitude a quarrel with the priest, often a flimsy excuse, exaggerated or positively untrue, but sometimes based at least on a lack of tact on the priest’s part. Some of our predecessors were kindly and saintly men who are still remembered with gratitude, but there were others who preferred the stick to the carrot and seriously thought that their parishioners were incapable of rising above these alternatives.

MARRIED PERSONS

	<i>S</i>			<i>G</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>p.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>l.</i>	<i>p.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>l.</i>	
Married to Catholics	35 ¹	15	2	87 ¹	8	4	151
Married to Protestants:							
Husband Catholic	1	4	5	2	1	—	13
Wife Catholic ..	8	6	7	18	4	1	44
Married outside Church:							
Both Catholics ..	—	—	4	—	—	—	4
Husband Catholic	—	—	8	—	—	3	11
Wife Catholic ..	—	—	7	—	—	3	10
Married as Anglican in C. of E., con- verted, divorced	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
<i>Total</i>	44	25	33	107	13	12	234

¹ These odd numbers are explained by the facts that in one family the husband practises but the wife does not and in another the wife is living apart from her husband.

UNMARRIED, AGE-GROUP 15 TO 30

	<i>S</i>			<i>G</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>p.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>l.</i>	<i>p.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>l.</i>	
Both parents Catholic:							
Boys	3	3	2 ¹	5	3	2	18
Girls	10	—	—	10	1	—	21
One parent Protestant:							
Boys	1	2	11 ¹	2	—	—	16
Girls	1	5	2	2	—	—	10
Parents married outside Church:							
Boys	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Girls	—	—	1	—	—	1	2
Convert, girl ..	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
<i>Total</i>	16	10	16	19	4	4	69

¹ Three sons of mixed marriages and one with two Catholic parents, described as lapsed, were baptized but never brought up as Catholics.

OVER 30, UNMARRIED, WIDOWS OR WIDOWERS

	<i>S</i>		<i>G</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>p.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>p.</i>	<i>s.</i>	
Bachelors	3	2	9	1	15
Spinsters	2	—	20	—	22
Widowers	2	—	1	2	5
Widows	7	3	9	2	21
<i>Total</i>	14	5	39	5	63

The division in the age-group 5 to 15, between children at Catholic schools and those who are not, does not indicate the extent to which they practise. We have all come across parents

who consider that their duty is completely fulfilled when they have sent their children to a Catholic school and care little about the observances outside school hours; there are also parents who with good reasons, after obtaining permission, send their children elsewhere, but take the greatest care to bring them up in the knowledge and practice of the faith. But there is usually some neglect combined with worldliness at least where the children never attend a Catholic school; and the chances of maintaining the faith are far greater for those who have been all their time at Catholic schools—not least because, in this parish, parents must have been very keen and energetic to send them there. From any point it is a considerable distance to the nearest Catholic school, involving expenditure on bus fares and sometimes a fair amount of walking. To reach one of the three schools about equally distant from S it is necessary sometimes to take two buses and always to walk farther than the average child today cares to do. From G it is possible to take a bus almost from door to door, but the journey is long for very young children and expensive for all. Numbers are not sufficient to justify the building of a primary school, even if funds were available, and a site easily accessible from all parts of the parish does not exist.

AGE-GROUP 5 TO 15

	S		G		Total
	<i>At Catholic Schools</i>	<i>Not at Catholic Schools</i>	<i>At Catholic Schools</i>	<i>Not at Catholic Schools</i>	
Both parents Catholic ..	8	7	15	5	35
One parent Protestant ..	9	8	10	8	35
Parents married outside Church	—	3	—	—	3
<i>Total</i> ..	17	18	25	13	73

UNDER 5

	S		G		Total
	<i>Likely to be brought up as Catholics</i>	<i>Unbaptized</i>	<i>Likely to be brought up as Catholics</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	
Both parents Catholic ..	7	1	16	—	24
One parent Protestant ..	6	—	12	2	20
Parents married outside Church	1 ¹	—	1 ¹	—	2
<i>Total</i> ..	14	1	29	2	46

These statistics represent nothing more than the raw material on which priests and people have to work. The biggest difficulty is perhaps to convince the good Catholics that they have to do more than set a good example and provide money to support the priest in his spiritual ministrations. It is also hard for them to grasp the fact that they are not the Italian band, but the representatives of authentic Christianity in these parts with a mission to the thousands not included in the statistics. But there are grounds for hope. Respect for the priest makes them listen readily even to new and unfamiliar ideas; and they take part eagerly in a Dialogue Mass on a mid-week evening.

"PAROCHUS"

¹ There is no inconsistency here. Divorce is involved in both instances and therefore revalidation of the marriage is impossible, but assurances of the Catholic upbringing of the children were given at the time of Baptism. The two Catholic fathers are not lacking in faith, but only in courage of an unusual order.

AN EXPERIMENT IN CHURCH BUILDING

THE chapel-of-ease was a wooden hut with a corrugated-iron roof about thirty feet square. The Mass attendance was about one hundred and twenty, but by the end of 1955 twenty or thirty people were standing outside. The need for more accommodation became increasingly urgent, and ways and means were sought to raise the necessary capital. The parish had £2000 in trust for the building of a new church but this would obviously not be sufficient; the credit squeeze, then in full operation, precluded borrowing from the usual sources, but an appeal was made to the parishioners to help in two ways: (1) by giving their labour in building a church, (2) by loaning the parish amounts of up to £25, for a period of five years free of interest. The parish is a small one and it would be easy to repay £25 at short notice whereas a larger sum would prove more difficult; larger parishes could no doubt make the loan ceiling higher. All classes in the parish contributed to the best of their ability, some even lending to the project the sums they had laid aside for their burial. This appeal raised £810 and another £300 was found from private sources.

In the past five years the writer had seen many new churches of various sizes, the costs of which seemed to be very high, and he was certain that a great deal of the work could be done by parochial labour, even though unskilled, thereby considerably reducing costs. Many, too, of these churches after a short time had been found to be too small, so it was decided to build the transept of a large church, the nave of which could be added at a later date; the walls of the transept to be designed so that their height could be considerably increased when the extensions took place: in the meantime the building would be used as a hall-church.

The problem, then, was to build an instalment of a permanent church with unskilled labour and to avoid too much expenditure. This was solved by the design of a cruciform church, building permanently only the transepts, the nave to be added later. This involved merely limited use of skilled labour on the transept walls, the temporary filling panels being

completed with timber framing and cladding which could be erected, under supervision, with some semi- or un-skilled labour.

The structure, therefore, lent itself very readily to modern prefabrication methods, and between the traditional transept walls, light framing and trusses of timber enclosed the building. This is contemporary in style and follows simply and directly from the problem set. It comprises a building 70×40 ft. with a spacious hall, 48×38 ft., clerestory lighting on each side, temporary transept windows at the east and west end and a seating capacity of 210. The screened-off sanctuary has been designed with glass over the sliding doors to increase the apparent space and length of the hall. Colour has been introduced to produce an emphasis on the altar, an effect increased by the splayed sides of the sanctuary. Behind the site of the future high altar, i.e. in the head of the cruciform plan and on the site of the permanent sacristies, are built cloakrooms, kitchen and sacristy. It is worth noting that a good-quality facing-brick was used, suitable for public buildings.

Some Irishmen in the parish had joined together in a working party and they were given the job of preparing the foundations and footings. They were paid for this and, starting in mid-June, finished in about three weeks. The work of various bricklayers in the district had been inspected, and the most proficient of these was invited to undertake the bricklaying; from the architect's plans he worked out his own quantities, finishing his work in about six weeks.

From this point the men of the parish came into their own. Apart from plasterers, electricians and floor-layers, no further professional labour was used. As soon as the foundations were finished and while the brickwork was going up, the roof trusses were being prepared on the site—these were five in number with a span of 40 ft. built entirely of wood. Every evening and week-ends the men came, some skilled, some not; the trusses were ready for erection by the beginning of August. The men put them up with block and tackle and telegraph pole and all was prepared for the fixing of the roof sheets by the end of the month. Most of these sheets were fixed in one day, a large contingent of men being urged to come for the occasion. To preclude echoes and ensure warmth, the roof was lined inside with

insulation board, the fixing of which was facilitated by a movable gantry. As the evenings were now drawing in, this operation took ten weeks. The temporary north wall was completed during this period and lined on the inside with matchboarding previously taken out of the old hall. In the meantime one of the men attended to all the plumbing in the cloakrooms and kitchen. Professionals were employed for the plastering and screeding of the floors, both of which were finished by mid-November. Decorating took place thence until the bazaar on 8 December.

From this time little work was done until early in the New Year when preparations were begun on the sanctuary, divided from the body of the hall by a sliding screen. Decoration was carried out by the use of contrasting coloured plywood panels, surmounted by symbols of St Thomas More (crossed keys; axe and block; Tower and portcullis; Speaker's mace; crossed quill pens). The dark oak altar was that used in the old hall, and the candlesticks, silver-plated, were made by local craftsmen. Finally a wood-block floor was laid a week prior to the official opening on 10 February 1957.

Summary.—No contractor was appointed for the work, the parish priest himself being the clerk of the works and general foreman. He had little previous experience, but this proved no handicap as the technical knowledge was acquired as the work progressed.

Considerable saving was achieved in that all materials for the project, whether used by amateurs or professionals, were bought by us in bulk at trade prices and discounts.

The architect's solution of the problem, through being simple, enabled most of the work to be attempted by men who had no previous experience in this field.

Conclusion.—It seems certain from this experiment that similar types of buildings with a seating capacity of up to 250 could be erected in the same way. In every district there are parties of men or small firms willing to undertake work by direct labour and hence professional assistance should present no problem; most parishes would have men sufficiently qualified, even though retired, to undertake the responsibility of clerk of the works and ordering materials. It was found that though the

men of the parish were reluctant to volunteer in the beginning, because of their lack of experience, as the work progressed more came forward encouraged by the success of the pioneers. With the completion of the building, not only was the problem of increased accommodation solved for the time being, but the parochial morale, which till then had been about average, has now been infused with a spirit of enthusiasm and pride which is manifesting itself in many new activities.

<i>Statement of Costs</i>				£
Sand and Ballast	90
Cement and Lime	162
Drain Pipes	57
Bricks	400
Timber and Boards	340
Sanitary Ware and fittings	68
Rainwater pipes	43
Windows	71
Doors and sliding gear	135
Block-flooring	210
Electric fittings	54
Paint and distemper	40
Glass	30
Roofing asbestos, felt, guttering, etc.	204
Bolts, nails and sundries	131
				— £2035

<i>Professional labour costs</i>				
Foundations	200
Drains	76
Paths	26
Bricklayer	384
Plasterers	90
Electricians	80
				— £856

<i>Other building expenses</i>				
Haulage and hire of plant	123
Architect's Fees	180
Mains services and insurance	36
				— £339

Grand Total £3230

"P. P."

WHEN IS A COM NOT A COM?

CHILDREN of Mary are so well known in the Church that it would seem unnecessary for a Catholic to ask what they are. They are sometimes called the COMS—with a familiarity arising from their presence everywhere as a parish society, mentioned at least once a month in the notices, and brightening one section of church processions with blue cloaks and ribbons. They are of all ages, from adolescence to reminiscence, and of all classes and conditions except that in some places Children of Mary have to leave the confraternity when they marry, and that some members are *Enfants de Marie*—not COM but E de M.

This pleasant and rather vague universality has in recent years been rudely disturbed; and parish clergy, amongst others, have been driven to wonder: When is a COM not a COM? Senior girls, from schools which not so long ago were sending out every year a new generation of Children of Mary, refuse the title of Child of Mary, and, alleging that the parish confraternity is not their organization, refuse to join it. They are, they say, not Children of Mary but Sodalists.

Those in charge of parish Children of Mary, anxious to keep up the strength of the confraternity and to keep down the average age of its members, and already distressed by the tendency of grammar schools to drain off young blood from parish life, ask what's in a name. Sodalists are consecrated to our Lady with a formula which used to make Children of Mary. Why can't they bring their young vigour to enliven the confraternity in the parish? The reproach to the reluctant can be strengthened in many parishes where the parish priest has a framed and faded diploma in the sacristy declaring the affiliation of the parish Children of Mary to the "Roman Sodality". If it is the Sodality of our Lady which is wanted, here it is.

Misunderstanding will continue until the facts about "Children of Mary" are known. There will be puzzled parish priests, convent schools uneasy with their chaplain from the parish, Children of Mary resentful of neglect, and sodalists unhappy in their refusal to join the parish confraternity.

The essential facts are these: there exist two distinct organizations, the Confraternity of Children of Mary and the Sodality of our Lady; both men and women can be Sodalists; the distinction between Confraternity and Sodality has been obscured or lost; and the Sodality is now, by direction of the Pope, recovering its original spirit and trying to live the life proper to it.

The Apostolic Constitution, *Bis Saeculari* (1948), shows the concern of Pius XII, himself a Sodalist, for the revival and spread of the Sodality.

Why revival? Because, after a good start and an honourable career, it lost some of its apostolic spirit and changed its style.

It was founded in 1563 in the Roman College by a group of boys under their master, Fr John Leunis, S.J. That Sodality has had ever since a primacy amongst all others, and is called *Prima Primaria*. Official constitution is given to other Sodalities of our Lady by affiliation to the Sodality of the Roman College.

The purpose of the Roman College Sodality was to unite its members by consecration to our Lady and under her patronage in the twin works of personal sanctification and apostolate. They were to meet regularly for prayers, and were to plan together a campaign of service of their neighbour in his needs, seeing and taking their opportunities of charity. Most of their work was done as hospital orderlies and amongst the poor.

The idea caught on and was widely adopted. Catholics of the age, when they strove to live up to their baptism, at once thought of an apostolate. The countries lost to the Church, and the weakness of the Church in many of its remaining members, challenged the fighting spirit of bishops, priests, and laymen. The Sodality was one of the answers to the challenge; and it proved so successful that it was approved by Pope Gregory XIII and fostered by such bishops as Charles Borromeo and Francis of Sales. Edmund Campion directed a Sodality in Prague. Some thirty of the English martyrs were Sodalists. The Society of Jesus had sponsored the first Sodality, and the Sodality followed the Jesuits wherever they went: but it was never an exclusively Jesuit organization—the majority of modern Sodalities, 98 per cent of them, are governed directly by the bishops.

The Sodality during its first two hundred years was exclusively for boys and men. In 1751 Pope Benedict XIV sanctioned Sodalities of girls and women.

So long as the Sodalities kept to their Rules, they flourished. Their ideal is high but attractive; and the faithful performance of Sodality duties maintains their supernatural energy and effectiveness and gives a pride in membership. Sodalists should take part in the Mass and receive Holy Communion every day if possible (duties of charity and justice in their state of life helping to define what is "possible" for them). They should make fifteen minutes of mental prayer a day and also say the Rosary or some part of the Office of our Lady. Their obligation of charity is permanent and universal, and it requires their steady attention. As those obligations are not within everyone's range, indiscriminate recruitment weakens rather than strengthens the Sodality. Even now there are schools where membership of the "Children of Mary"—strictly a Sodality—is settled by age, or membership of a class, or the status of school-prefect. It is only the externals of Sodality life which are voluntarily adopted; and neglect of the ideal brings the Sodality into disrepute.

What still happens in some schools has already happened throughout the country since the early decades of this century. The type of religious society in parishes was the confraternity or guild with a monthly meeting and Communion Sunday and an occasional procession. Where it existed, the Sodality tended to take that form, instead of keeping to its original form and purpose. It ceased to be the active, alert, apostolic group it was meant to be, and enlarged itself into a full muster of those observant and biddable parishioners, girls and women, willing to consecrate themselves to our Lady: it was pious but passive. It merged in many places with the Confraternity of Children of Mary, founded with a different spirit and for a different purpose by the Vincentian Fathers. Men's Sodalities could not merge with the Confraternity, but they also tended to adopt the prevailing fashion. It is no wonder that those whose sanction is necessary for the setting up of a new religious society in the parish—parish priests, for example—do not see why a Sodality should be asked for when a Confraternity exists.

The Holy Father's Apostolic Constitution gives the Sodality

no choice: it must be a "Catholic Action" body, or it is false to its origin, tradition and constitution.

Offering itself as an apostolic society, the Sodality does not deny or minimize the value of the Confraternity of Children of Mary. There are many of those confraternities whose active and sensible charity is a notable help in a parish and deserving of all admiration. Even if a confraternity is no more than a regular public homage to our Lady, a monthly Communion, a regular meeting for prayer and a talk on the spiritual life, and a regular cup of tea, it is an honourable body in its own right, and no doubt its members have their quiet and private apostolate in their own homes and their places of work. The difference between them and the Sodalities can be stated in military terms as the difference between garrison troops in orderly and effective occupation of conquered territory and commandos probing for weak spots in the defences of a strong and guileful enemy. The Sodalist should consider himself always in training and always in action.

The true Sodality—what is now called in the U.S.A. the "*Bis Saeculari* Sodality"—differs in constitution and purpose from the Confraternity of Children of Mary, and it is bound to differ in membership and the way it works. A parish priest told me not long ago that in his church there is a plaque commemorating the fifty years in office of a President of the Children of Mary. However laudable such persevering and devoted loyalty may be, there is no doubt that it betokens endurance rather than liveliness, and that it is unlikely to attract the co-operation of the young. Moreover, insistence on hard training in supernatural living, with much use of prayer and frequent participation in the Mass and the Sacraments, and on the daily obligation of effective and wide-ranging charity, means a careful selection, by themselves and their director, of aspirants to the Sodality. Not all good Catholics, clients of our Lady, are willing and able to put into their Christian living the time, energy and initiative which the Sodality must require. In parish life there is room for both the Confraternity of Children of Mary and the Sodality: and the Bishop of Southwark has made provision for their co-existence in his diocese.

That the two must work in different ways is clear from the

intensive and protracted training that Sodalists must undergo. The Sodalist must develop a strong personal love for our Lord and for His Mother, and an urgent sense of personal responsibility for the spiritual and temporal needs of his fellows. The twin developments of union with Christ and charity to his human creatures call for growing sensitiveness in the Sodalist to supernatural standards, a steadily increasing use of prayer and the Sacraments, and an ever sharper alertness to the needs of others for which responsibility is always assumed in mind and heart, and outwardly in accordance with circumstances.

Sodalists are trained in their weekly meetings, and in special Training Days and Training Courses of from five days to a week.

Most Catholic Action bodies follow in their meetings the familiar practice of Gospel Enquiry for the deepening of their Christian understanding, and investigation of the best means of spreading Christian truth. The Sodalities have their meeting each week which begins with the Gospel Enquiry and continues with what is called "routine action". The main charity of Sodalists must be at home—in their family and parish, their place of work, and, in general, in the routine of their lives. They are supposed to grow in awareness of the people with whom they live, and to whom they have a permanent obligation just because they share life with them. Much of the charity they exercise will not be a matter of report; but they will sometimes want the help of their colleagues: prayers for a conversion, the judgement of others on news they bring of the apostolate. They learn to go through their day with a Catholic alertness, like troops out on reconnaissance, and to report threats to truth or goodness which they should counter, or operations for the spread of Christianity which they should assist. They also learn the need of maintaining their supernatural vigour by participating in the life of our Lord in the Mass and the Sacraments and by their prayer.

The last part of the meeting aims at enlarging the minds and hearts of Sodalists by getting them to concentrate on the spiritual and corporal works of mercy in some form—a need of mankind, or a nation, or their townsfolk, for spiritual or material help. In recent years the Sodalities have studied the national

Press, the purposes and methods of the Family Planning Association, materialist standards in the country, the numbers and condition of the old and infirm, and the care taken of them and others in need such as orphans and displaced persons. Not all the enquirers are able to respond with a gift of their time and labour for those whose need they have come to know: but they are enlightened, and their hearts are open in genuine love and fellow-feeling—to their own great benefit and that of those to whom mind and heart have gone out not to be recalled.

A brisk and efficient meeting on those lines every week is an invaluable stimulus to the double Christian duty of being alive and being alive towards God and our neighbour. There is a further developing influence in the system: it works under directors, but they are directors of the initiative of the sodalists and not a substitute for their self-starting and self-management. The Sodality always needs a director—a priest—appointed by the Ordinary: but he is more like the expert adviser of a commando unit than regimental officer leading his men. Sound doctrine and wholesome principles of spiritual life can be made the personal possession of the Sodalists more effectively by unobtrusive guidance in the gospel enquiry and enquiries towards charity than by formal exhortations or sermons. Such a method of bringing learners up to truth and goodness by guiding them in their search for it and letting them make the pace takes more out of the director than the simpler method of putting ready-found truth in front of them with a take-it-or-leave-it finality: but it achieves its purpose.

In brief, then:

1. The Confraternity of Children of Mary and the Sodality of our Lady are two different bodies: members of the first are Children of Mary, members of the second are Sodalists.
2. The Sodality, returning to its origins at the behest of the Holy Father, has an alert and active apostolic life.
3. It has also a brisk and business-like technique of its own, which, helped by Training Days and Training Courses (there are to be five of them this summer), it can use for itself under the guidance of a priest-director.
4. Lived properly, the Sodality programme will meet all a Catholic's requirements for both supernatural development

(outside the priesthood and religious life) and for the lay apostolate.

5. In that sense, the Sodality takes up all the potential of the willing Catholic, and to belong at the same time to both the Sodality and, for example, the Children of Mary or the Legion of Mary, would be illogical and would indicate inefficiency. (The principle would work the other way: the Legion of Mary, also, can employ all the willingness of any member.)

6. But the Sodality is not exclusive in the sense of withdrawing its members from their milieu. On the contrary, it requires them to exercise full charity where they are. The "home" of a parish Sodality is the parish, the "home" of an undergraduate Sodality is the University Chaplaincy. It is there that the action of charity begins, and from there that it is guided.

Those principles are given an authoritative statement in the Apostolic Constitution, *Bis Saeculari*. The following Twelve Points from *Bis Saeculari*, taken from the 1951 edition of the Common Rules of the Sodality of our Lady, will serve as summary and conclusion: they are "common to all Sodalities of our Lady everywhere, and to be strictly observed by them all".

1. Sodalities of our Lady, duly affiliated to the *Prima Primaria* of the Roman College, are religious societies erected and established by the Church and have been enriched with the fullest privileges by her for the better fulfilment of the work entrusted to them.

2. That only is to be considered a lawful Sodality which has been set up by the Ordinary who has power to do so; that is to say, in places belonging to the Society of Jesus or entrusted to its care, by the Father General, in all other places by the bishop of the place, or, with his formal consent, by the aforesaid Father General. In order that a Sodality thus erected should enjoy all the privileges and indulgences granted to the *Prima Primaria*, it must be duly affiliated to it. This affiliation, however, which may only be sought with the consent of the Ordinary of the place and which it is in the power only of the General of the Society of Jesus to grant, gives neither to the *Prima Primaria* nor to the Society of Jesus any rights over such a Sodality.

3. Sodalities, since they answer fully to the present-day

needs of the Church, must, in accordance with the will of Sovereign Pontiffs, keep intact their laws, their character and constitution.

4. The Common Rules, whose observance, in substance at least, is required for affiliation, are earnestly recommended to all Sodalists as a summary and pattern of the way of life followed by the first Sodalists and established by constant practice.

5. All Sodalities, with a dependence that may differ in minor matters though substantially the same, are subject to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy not less than other organizations consecrated to apostolic works.

6. While following faithfully in the footsteps of those who preceded them and keeping abreast of the times, lest, in propagating the kingdom of God and defending the rights of the Christian warfare, their own ranks be thrown into disorder and their forces weakened, Sodalists should be mindful of the following points:

(a) That the local Ordinary

(1) has power, as laid down in the Sacred Canons, saving always the prescripts and documents of the Apostolic See, over all Sodalities within his jurisdiction with regard to the external exercise of the Apostolate;

(2) has power over Sodalities that are erected outside the houses of the Society of Jesus and can accordingly give them rules provided the substance of the Common Rules remains intact.

(b) The parish priest

(1) is the normal president of parish Sodalities, which he accordingly governs as the other societies of his parish;

(2) possesses over all the Sodalities engaged in apostolic work in his parish that power which has been given him by Canon Law and by legitimate diocesan statute for the right ordering of the external apostolate.

7. Any legitimately appointed director of a Sodality, who of course must always be a priest, although he is altogether subject to his ecclesiastical Superiors, enjoys however, according to the

Common Rules, complete power in the internal life of the Sodality. It is fitting that he should generally exercise this power by means of Sodalists, chosen to help him in his office.

8. These Sodalities are to be called "Sodalities of our Lady" not only because they take their name from the Blessed Virgin Mary, but especially because each Sodalist makes profession of special devotion to the Mother of God and is dedicated to her by a complete consecration, undertaking, though not under pain of sin, to strive by every means and under the standard of the Blessed Virgin for his own perfection and eternal salvation as well as for that of others. By this consecration the Sodalist binds himself forever to the Blessed Virgin Mary, unless he is dismissed from the Sodality as unworthy, or himself through fickleness of purpose relinquishes the same.

9. In the enrolment of Sodalists care should be taken to choose those who are by no means satisfied with an ordinary and common kind of life, but who strive "to place the most lofty sentiments in their hearts" (Ps. lxxxiii).

10. It is the duty then of Sodalities of our Lady to train their members according to the condition of each, so that they can be proposed as models to their companions of Christian life and apostolic endeavour.

11. Among the primary ends of Sodalities is to be reckoned every kind of apostolate, especially the social apostolate for the propagation of the kingdom of Christ and the defence of ecclesiastical rights, entrusted to them by the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. To further this true and complete co-operation with the hierarchical apostolate the norms proper to the Sodalities, determining the means of this co-operation, are in no way to be changed or modified.

12. Finally, the Sodalities of our Lady are to be considered on the same level as the other organizations dedicated to the apostolate, whether they are allied to these, or to the central organization of Catholic Action. Moreover, since it is the duty of Sodalities, under the guidance and authority of their pastors, to lend their aid to every other organization it is not required that each Sodalist should also become a member of some other association.

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

THE AFFECTIVITY OF CHRIST

THERE occurs in St Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews a Biblical hapaxlegomenon which has considerably exercised translators. This word, *metriopathein*, is used by Paul to describe one of Christ's priestly characteristics, and hence has a significance for us beyond the merely scholarly. "For every high-priest taken from among men is appointed for men in the things pertaining to God that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sin. He is able to *have compassion* (*metriopathein*) on the ignorant and erring, because he also is beset with weakness and by reason thereof is obliged to offer for sins, as on behalf of the people, so also for himself" (Heb. v, 1-4). This is the Confraternity translation of the text in question.

The Latin of *metriopathein* is given as *condolere*. This does not precisely *translate* the Greek word, but it does open such lofty perspectives with regard to the psychology of the Incarnate Word that most translators have fastened upon it as perfectly expressing Paul's thought. The resonances which this word sets up in the Christian soul are amply reinforced in a dozen Evangelical texts. While the Greek word offers certain obvious difficulties of interpretation and suggests historical antecedents of dubious theological value, the Latin awakens a chord of experience so fully and authentically Christian that most translators of Paul have simply transferred its meaning to their vernacular and reserved their commentary for the Latin phrase.

Quite aside from hermeneutical reasons it is natural that translators should bring forth the notion of sympathy in the text since that attitude of soul receives such prominence in the Gospel literature. The Gospels are curiously reticent documents, not given to subtle expositions of Christ's psychology, and that they should record for us this identical inner attitude of Christ with the frequency that they do, proves the strong impression this attitude of Jesus made upon the Evangelists. Aside from explicit references to compassion on Jesus' part, one might almost say that the entire Gospel story, especially as related by Luke, is a record of Jesus' ability to appreciate the sufferings of others, of His experience of that inner grief from

which charity towards others naturally springs. *Condolere* could be said to be in some sense a central theme of the Gospel story. It is this ready human power to enter into the sorrows of others that is aptly summed up in this one word *condolere*. Paul remarks it as the central *human* quality of Christ the priest, and since Christ is essentially priest we are not surprised to find this quality occupying the central position that it actually does occupy in the Gospels. Yet in the ultimate analysis the Latin *condolere* does little more than state a fact. It gives us *one* of the sublime inner spiritual directions of God Incarnate, it provokes a flood of suggestive meditations about our Lord; it reverses for ever certain pagan evaluations and ethical conceptions, it hints at a completely new approach to that mode of being which is personal, an approach closed to the Greek mind but which Christianity opened to all who could see; but it does not offer grounds for a theoretical exposition of more than this one affective response. It gives no suggestion as to the existence of any norm of judging the validity and spiritual worth of affective responses in general, but only of this particular response of sympathy, compassion.

It is, however, quite possible that the word *metriopathein*, which is more general in meaning than *condolere*, may offer possibilities for a greater understanding, from within, of Christ's affective life. For it obviously refers His affective responses to some norm or measure or rule, and the discovery of the norm may serve to clarify questions with regard to our Lord's entire affective life. Certainly *a priori* the theologian will affirm that the Incarnate Word possessed the most perfect human affections of any man. Yet the precise nature of affectivity has been beclouded by so many and such persistent preconceptions and misunderstandings throughout history that the norm for judging perfection in this sphere is not immediately evident. If, as seems to be the case, St Paul is here assigning as Christ's prime human qualification for the priesthood this perfection of inner harmony throughout the whole range of human affectivity, then the discovery of the norm implied in *metriopathein* cannot fail to throw light on Christ's priesthood. Since Christ is essentially priest it cannot fail to throw light on Christ's approach to reality as a whole.

In establishing the precise meaning of this norm which is implied in the Greek text, historical antecedents for the word help us but little. First, one is not certain whence Paul derived this unusual word, and secondly, if one were, it is not at all certain that decision as to its full significance would be any easier. For there is always the danger of introducing into our thinking about the Incarnate Word concepts which when unfolded involve prolongations of pagan ethical ideals.

Metriopathein is not entirely an uncommon word in Greek philosophical literature and there its meaning is closely defined. In Stoic philosophy *metriopathein* refers to the moderation of the man as yet imperfect, the man who has not yet achieved that insensitivity, impassibility, which is the *apatheia* of the perfect. The *metron*, the norm, in Stoic thought is the total absence of responsiveness. It is patent that if St Paul derived the word from Stoic sources he completely abandoned the meaning it had in Stoic philosophy. The Christian ideal has never been that deeply unrealistic ideal of controlled selfishness extolled by the Stoic. For when such Fathers as Clement of Alexandria and John Climacus in the East and Cassian in the West propose *apatheia* to us as an ideal, by it they mean a supreme subjection of the inferior appetites to reason. Nor is their *apatheia* offered to us as a terminal ideal but merely as an ascetical propaedeutic to charity.¹

Aristotelian philosophy had, however, used this word to describe the man of perfect virtue. Such a man would not be insensitive, not unresponsive to an appeal to the affections but rather perfectly regulated, perfectly measured in his responses.² Unfortunately, when the word is projected against the background of Aristotle's *Ethics* it conveys certain unhappy connotations to the Christian mind. It suggests a man whose self-control, whose measured attitudes look more to dignity than to virtue. The *καλὸν καγαθόν* in Aristotle's *Ethics* ultimately resolves itself into the choice decided on by noble men, the measure adopted by great-hearted souls—which has all the appearances of an ethical *ignorantia elenchi*. There is an intimation present in the Aristotelian formula of the presence of some

¹ C. Bardy, *Apatheia*, D.S., pp. 729-44.

² Diogenes Laertes, p. 81.

Platonic archetype of ideal-response which governs affective responses independently of the object motivating such responses. To the Aristotelian man Christ at the tomb of Lazarus, Christ in the darkness of Gethsemane might seem undignified, His responses excessive.

The fact of the matter is that it is not ancient pagan philosophy which will open to us the meaning of the measure Paul implied in the expression, *metriopathein*. For here we are again confronted with one of those new words which Christianity has spoken to the philosophic mind, and it is rather the mind fecundated by Christian revelation which will disengage the new ideal here proposed in Christ, as the unique exemplary cause of perfection in the affective sphere. If we turn to pre-Christian thought we shall discover only that affectivity is an epiphenomenon of the body, a product of that dark world of matter which is not only opaque to reason but an enemy of the spirit. The *redeemability* of the world of affectivity did not even occur to any ancient philosopher but Plato, and in him there was lacking the metaphysics for any valid evaluation of this sphere.

There is a perennial need, even for the Christian, to rediscover the spirituality of affectivity, for there are not a few obstacles to his accepting the very possibility of spiritual affections.¹ Historically Christian philosophy has incompletely explored the structure and the significance of affectivity. It has been embarrassed in its metaphysical analyses by the poverty of empirical findings offered to it by the psychologists.

Among the moral obstacles there is one which merits attention both for its perennial vigour and for the very classicity of the error it involves. So tenacious a hold has this attitude on certain minds that it merits a position among philosophic errors, since it seems without difficulty to find, in each century, new theoretical justifications which make it a very fecund source of distorted viewpoints on affectivity. We refer to that recurrent ethos of hardness which, from Gnosticism to Nietzscheism, has illegitimately strengthened its philosophic pretensions by an alliance with human pride. At the root of much speculative contempt for affectivity there can be discerned a basic pride in

¹ Cf. "Humani generis", *A.A.S.*, XLII (1950), p. 574.

being above every event, every situation that calls for a surrender, a self-renunciation. Not infrequently masquerading as a virtue, this metaphysically unjustifiable independence considers all surrender, although it be to the noblest of values, as a weakness. A radical weakness, a radical inability to face any situation where something is stronger and higher than oneself, is disguised as a certain virility. This icy form of pride involves two basic rejections; man's metaphysical situation as contingent, as viator, his ontological receptivity before God and being, is rejected on the one hand; on the other hand man's very dignity, his capacity to transcend himself, is repudiated. The resulting spastic state of inner conflict gradually numbs the capacity to respond to any value which calls for submission and self-transcendence.

The attitude of cramping hardness which shines out in this classical type of egoism considers all reverence, all compassion, all tears of contrition, even that affective response of adoration, as signs of mere weakness.¹ Such a spirit stands in polar opposition to the specific temper of every Christian virtue. Completely antithetical to the atmosphere of peace in which Christ moves, an atmosphere of meekness, of omnipotence in self-chosen bonds, this ethos emerges philosophically in a resentful denial of all of man's centrifugal powers, and predominantly of charity. When such an attitude has completed its theoretic justification it possesses an exquisitely dehumanizing power, for it refuses to accept man's primal finality, his dynamism to *pati divina*. Pride in the rigidity of immobility effectively cuts off that contact with the whole world of values which could nourish philosophic speculation on the nature of affective response to good. As a consequence the whole nature of affectivity is effectively closed to this type of philosopher. He is blind to the very object he would analyse.

This philosophical attitude appears destined to enjoy long life, for it is rooted in a not uncommon experience of being,

¹ Y. de Montcheuil analyses the "ressentiment" characteristic of this attitude in *Mélanges Théologiques* (Paris: Aubier, 1946), deuxième partie, ch. 2 and 3.

The humanism of the Church is reflected in her condemnation of the following propositions of Michael de Molinos: (1) *Dum anima interna fastidit discursus de Deo et virtutes et frigida manet, nullum in seipsa sentiens fervorem, bonum signum est (DB, 1249)*; (2) *totum sensible, quod experimur in vita spirituali, est abominabile, spurcum et immundum (DB, 1250)*.

which the atheist existentialist has analysed with morbid efficiency. The psychological roots of such an ethos are found in a pervasive cowardice, an eviscerating fear before the demands which being makes upon the soul, being in the plentitude of its range from finite to infinite.¹ Such a philosopher as described may well fear that unless he holds on to his soul with both hands he may lose it before reality which invites so consistently to self-surrender. His "solution" has been to put out the eye of his mind with regard to a whole class of objects: value objects. Scaling being down to the cosy dimensions of the comfortable, he has, historically, achieved a philosophic peace which is a very unstable equilibrium—for being has a way of resisting dictation.² Since experience is a quite basic presupposition for philosophic analysis and since this philosopher has cut himself off from experience of the object he would analyse, we can accept such a philosopher's analysis of spiritual affectivity for what it is—subjective impressions founded more in the emotions than in reason.

The Christian thinker who attempts to come to grips with the problem of spiritual affectivity has an incalculable advantage over his pagan predecessor. The single glowing fact to the existence of theandric composite Christ has established for the Christian a point of reference that illuminates every problem concerning man's nature. For the Christian thinker has been in such luminous and repeated contact with this central reality of Christ that he quite naturally locates any ethical problem in a new frame of reference. Having witnessed the royal majesty of this Man in His Passion, the Christian feels no compulsion to diminish the grief he has also witnessed in the Garden. He who has listened to His voice command death to surrender up its victim, experiences no discomfort at the tears of Christ.

At the outset of his examination of affectivity the Christian thinker finds a difficulty in the very language that deals with his subject. He encounters the one word "feeling" used to describe a range of experience whose variety and distinction is ill-suggested by the word feeling. At the end of the day the

¹ v. Hugo Rahner, "Introduction au concept de philosophie existentielle chez Heidegger", *Recherches des sciences religieuses*, Vol. XXX, 1940, pp. 152-71.

² D. Hildebrand, *Fundamental Moral Attitudes* (New York: Longmans Green), ch. 1.

labourer "feels" exhausted and the child "feels" sleepy; but so also St Theresa is said to "feel" the pangs of disprized love, the listener "feels" joy in attending to a Bach Chorale. It is evident that some of these feelings are pure states that require as a condition for their existence no knowledge of the objects which cause them. One may feel tired, sleepy, irritable and not know either the cause of the feeling or how the cause has operated to produce this feeling. Still less need we actually *experience* the process by which the cause achieves its effect. The intentional and spiritual part of man's nature is not indispensably called into play that these feelings may exist.

Other feelings such as joy, love, doubt, fear, sorrow demand that the object motivating them be in some way known—and this furnishes the basic distinction between feelings which are bodily states and spiritual feelings or spiritual affectivity. Spiritual affectivity is object-dependent in a special way. The responses of doubt, fear, sorrow are concerned with objects; they have an intentional character; the theme of such responses is not indeed knowledge, for the question here is not "what is it" but "is it good". Nonetheless knowledge of the object motivating the affection is absolutely presupposed. The value, the good in the object must be perceived, and in experience it is immediately evident that it is precisely this good which is motivating the affection.

The object gives to the person a content of knowledge; beyond this knowledge it evokes from him a reply, a word he speaks to the object because of its goodness; the person thus adds to his content of knowledge an experience of joy or sorrow. The response is not caused by some unknown cause, operating in an unintelligible manner. Rather the response given bears a fully intelligible, intentional relation to the perceived goodness of the object. The sinner who weeps for his sin is not pushed by a casuality impervious to rationality, he is moved by his knowledge of the tragic evil of sin, he is aware of why he is moved and he is aware that he should be so moved. The whole pattern is luminous and to align such spiritual states with bodily states is to disregard their spiritual nature. Certain higher spiritual affections announce their own spiritual character to us by their very quality, for veneration, indignation, admiration, love—

such responses as these cannot come into being except in dependence upon lofty goods.¹

Once the distinction is understood between feelings which are caused and those which are motivated by an intentional, meaningful grasp of the values inherent in objects, it will be evident that the norm, the regulating measure of affectivity is found in the object motivating that affectivity.

In evaluating the perfection of affective responses to good it is at once evident that charity, because of its supreme object, has for its measure to be without measure. The perfection of affective charity is total charity, nor can it know excess. It need be referred to but one norm, that absolute goodness which calls for total self-surrender.

Charity aside, before any complete evaluation can be made of the perfection of a response, we must first notice a fundamental distinction of three classes of responses, a distinction which is based on the character of the object which can motivate responses. There exist, first of all, within the framework of the intentional, certain responses which are essentially good. Such responses as veneration, love, admiration are of their very nature value-responses, dependent upon an objective good for they presuppose that the object to which they are directed is good and is given as good in experience. The objects to which such responses are directed render these responses essentially good. Such responses do not create any problem for the theologian of morals, for even if one should attempt to distort the structure of a response of this type he will not succeed. One may attempt to love evil, but the response produced will not be love.

There exists another class of affective responses, structurally ordained to a class of objects disconformed to man's nature so that these responses are never normally desirable. Hatred, jealousy, envy are such affections and such is their inner connexion with pride or with concupiscence that their very existence indicates moral disorder in the person accepting them.

A third group of affective responses possesses a character sufficiently flexible to admit their being aroused by objects good, bad or indifferent. To this class of responses belong joy

¹ Cf. Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Transformation in Christ* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948), pp. 396-401.

and sorrow and it is this class which has a special need of a measure to judge the response. The measure will, of course, be found in the object which motivates the response. If the object possesses authentic value, if it objectively calls upon man to surrender his enclosing egoism, to allow his heart to be touched, then in submitting to that appeal to transcend self, man is justified and rational. The objective rank of the good in question, within the hierarchy of good, will determine the *depth* of the response which is due. For each value has, as it were, its own inner connexion with a specific *stratum* in the soul. One may indeed, for example, permit sports or science or art or knowledge to play the role in one's life which God should play, but none of these goods will be able to touch the stratum that is destined to be touched by adoration of the living and true God.

Again there is a *qualitative* correspondence between value perceived and the response which is due. To offer to a morally important object the response that befits an esthetically appealing object is obviously *quality* of moral value. Further, the ideal *intensity* of the response due in each case will depend upon not only the rank of the good and its specific quality but above all the clarity with which these are *given* in the experience of the subject. This clarity, in turn, depends largely on the moral preparation of the experiencing subject. All men have the initial capacity to perceive moral values and yet this capacity can be either blunted or cultivated by the individual. As a consequence, that which appears to the blunt man to be a response of exaggerated intensity may not so appear to the saint. Francis' love of holy poverty is not unreasonable merely because it is not shared by the majority of bankers.

This brings us to the classical objection against including such spiritual affections as those discussed above within the sphere of morality—namely that they are not free. We cannot always command joy, sorrow and such affections. Nevertheless we may have an indirect responsibility for such affections. For although we cannot always freely initiate them they remain worthy of praise or blame for we can prepare for them, dispose ourselves for them, freely accept or freely reject them when given. We can answer the motivation of the good with a deeply personal yes or no. These responses have indeed at times the

character of gifts given—but where there is a giving there may also be the free personal act of receiving, and here responsibility is direct. Thus, susceptibility to value, responsiveness to a situation calling for an affective response depends upon factors within our free control.

If the analysis above be just, we may reasonably expect that the unique exemplary cause of all perfection, Christ, would demonstrate certain affective responses. Since the Redeemer of mankind had as His most pressing preoccupation the indigent mankind He had come to redeem, the sheep suffering without a Shepherd, it is perhaps only natural that the Redeemer should present to His biographers the spectacle of a profound and oft-renewed response of compassion. If compassion is a note heard again and again in the words of His mouth, if the spontaneous gesture to alleviate human misery betrays repeatedly a compassionate response of His heart, the explanation is not difficult to give. But it is noteworthy that the situations, the objects, the experiences which called forth from Christ this response of compassion were always the *great* human sorrows: the loss of the beloved son, the loss of the beloved brother, the weariness and exhaustion attendant on all great human effort. It was the greatest of all human defeats, the rejection of the divine gifts offered and reoffered that brought the tears over Jerusalem. It was not the stings of His own outrageous fortune that called out Christ's pity, for of that bloodless sentimentality which is moved at its own emotions, Christ had no shadow.

If the human person is shown in the Gospel as the object of Christ's most energetic affective responses, we should not be surprised, for the person is *perfectissima in rerum natura*. The *quality* of Christ's responses to the person, even when they are responses of holy anger and indignation, have a perfect, objective correspondence with the qualities of the good at stake. The person may be condemned, he is never treated as a mere object, a thing.

If the *intensity* of the Saviour's responses at times awed and astonished the beholders, as at the tomb of Lazarus, was it not that He, the sovereign Lord of life and death, understood the meaning of death far better than they?

The Gospel story, on every page, instances the plenitude of

Jesus' affective life, its perfect balance, its perfect correspondence to the objective situation. We witness, for example, so many different shades of the one response of love, as we behold Jesus facing, now His eternal Father, whose mandate caused Jesus to set His face towards Jerusalem, now again His disciples, whose dullness of heart had not been able to weary Jesus. Towards children, towards John, towards Peter, Jesus directs a love which has, in each case, its own proper quality, a quality that takes into full account the personal differences in each situation.

So it is with the entire range of spiritual affections that we discern in the Christ of the gospels. There is always the just measure of heartfelt response, the supremely right note is struck, the perfect humanity of this Man is in evidence. Indeed, the benignity and humanity of God, our Lord, has appeared. There is no hint of hardness or bluntness, no intimation of a less than perfect grasp of the good at stake. There is always the perfectly proportioned response. At every point we behold the High Priest who is able to have compassion, the Man taken from among men, who is able to experience in a just measure every noble, every gracious, every holy human affection, whose appraisal of the world, of its good and its evil, is divinely objective.

ROBERT W. GLEASON, S.J.

WORK FOR THE SICK

THE busy priest who spends a large part of his time in visiting his sick parishioners in their own homes or in hospital attains a wealth of knowledge on the subject of ill-health. He understands the material difficulties that arise when the bread-winner meets with a serious accident or contracts a disease which may incapacitate him for months or even years, which may render him unfit for any but light work in the future or even remove him completely from the ranks of the

wage-earners. The parish priest is a witness of the tragedies that occur when a working mother is struck down by illness and, if it be severe and prolonged, the home which depended on her care is broken up. In the hospital chronic wards, the chaplain becomes used to the sight of seemingly endless rows of beds, stretched sometimes three deep across the room, beds that contain old or permanently disabled people who lie and wait, with resignation or with fear, for the death which alone can open to them the door of freedom. Of sufferers from minor illnesses there is no lack, though possibly the priest may hear less of this phenomenon than the social worker. True, he will know all about the epidemics of influenza amongst adults and infectious diseases amongst children but, unless he has an unusual gift of sympathy, he may not hear much about the perpetual backaches, the frequent migraine, the constantly aching legs, and all the minor ailments which so many women take in their stride. Accustomed to constant discomfort in one part or another of the body, such women are unlikely to waste much time in referring to it when so pleasant an interruption to the daily routine as a visit from the parish priest occurs. Probably they will be too busy talking about their children, or their husbands, and wondering whether the kettle be on the boil and if Father will have a cup of tea.

Thinking of his constant contacts with the sick, the parish priest will remember with pleasure the devout amongst his invalids. He will rejoice in the old people passing sleepless and often painful nights in the recitation of the Rosary; he will be glad of the parents whose faith in God's goodness seems to grow with their afflictions, who cease to worry unduly about their dependents, believing that He will not leave them without support. The priest will remember, perhaps, the gaiety in pain, the resignation in the face of death of a lad whose former wildness had been the cause of great anxiety. It may be that he will remember a girl whose career was shattered at its outset by chronic illness and who learned to appreciate the career of prayer, pain and sacrifice that God had chosen for her in its place. Such memories will console the parish priest as he fulfils his daily task of visiting the sick and will fortify him in his far from infrequent encounters with good Catholics who are thrown

off their spiritual balance by ill-health and make, at the best, a grudging submission to its demands. There can be few priests who have not been saddened, from time to time, by the waste of so much of this opportunity of taking part in the redemptive work of Christ by the offering to Him of the sufferings and humiliations of illness lovingly endured. How the Missions of the Church would prosper, how quickly our country might return to the Fold of Christ, how greatly the hands of God's priests would be strengthened in their work if every Catholic invalid made the best use of the talent of his disabilities! We love to think of our Blessed Lady as a young girl, the loving and perfect Mother of the Divine Child Jesus; in times of grief, we find consolation in contemplating the Mother of Sorrows standing so courageously by the Saviour's Cross. Perhaps we do not always give sufficient thought to the constant prayer with which Mary must have fortified Her Incarnate Son when He was busied with the labours of His mission and She could do nothing but pray and offer to Him the sorrow of Their separation. Surely Her fortitude at Calvary was the fruit of those silent years of prayerful suffering endured with the perfection of loving submission of which She alone was capable.

To awaken the more worldly-minded Catholic to the positive values of ill-health, to help him to see the worth of the treasure he is squandering, is no easy task. If the invalid thinks that the priest is altogether too much out of this world in his teaching, he is likely to refuse such a measure of help as otherwise he might have gained. Incredible as it may appear, there are people who will reply to any suggestion about the use of suffering by the statement: "Oh, I'm not nearly so good as all that." How can such shallow thinking be deepened so that it may embrace the Church's teaching on the place of reparation in the life of the Mystical Body? How can hearts grown hard and cold in the search for self-gratification be warmed until they burn and glow with the fire of Jesus' love; how can that seed of grace, implanted in the soul at baptism and nourished by occasional or even frequent reception of the Sacraments, be given the opportunity to develop so that, by its means, the interior conversion of the invalid may be accomplished? The priest who is himself a man of prayer, who has learned to

recog
life,
awar
fulfil
obvie
his p
T
and
frien
inter
pligh
work
lines
reser
inval
that
anyt
great
their
caus
who
depr
perie
Offe
fello
Relig
enco
the s
V
time
inva
foun
rapi
fulfi
the
norm
dom
num
dise

recognize God's Will in all the difficulties and sufferings of his life, will accomplish much, though often he may remain unaware of his achievement or of the way in which it has been fulfilled. He will teach, not so much by his words, as by the obvious sincerity of his convictions and by the silent depths of his passionate love of God and of souls.

The days, and often the nights, of the invalid are very long, and whether he be at home or in hospital, surrounded by friends or by strangers, or living in one room alone, often he is intensely lonely. He longs for friends who will understand his plight, he longs to take his rightful place amongst those who work and play. Even though he be but partially disabled, loneliness may be his lot for all his little store of energy must be reserved for work. It may be through this loneliness that the invalid may be best approached, for the majority will come to that point of utter desperation when they will be glad to try anything that offers to alleviate in any slightest measure the greatest of their afflictions. To talk to the spiritually unaware of their place in the unity of the Mystical Body may be merely to cause them to feel a greater degree of exasperation. Even those who are seeking to live an interior life may know times of great depression, when isolation closes round them and they experience no consolation from the belief that they profess. Offered the opportunity of uniting with a concrete body of fellow-sufferers, of sharing in some measure in the work of a Religious Community of the Sick, of receiving regular letters of encouragement and instruction, such lonely invalids may see in the suggestion a glimmer of hope for the future.

Various Associations of the Sick have been formed from time to time, but it is only since 1930 that a Congregation of invalids has existed. The Congregation of Jesus Crucified, founded at Brou-sur-Chantereine, near Paris, has shown by the rapidity of its growth the extent of the need it was created to fulfil. Living as enclosed contemplative Religious, devoted to the liturgy, busy with all the intellectual and artistic activities normally to be found in Benedictine Houses, as well as in the domestic and agricultural work of the Community, the Sisters number amongst their ranks sufferers from a variety of physical diseases as well as those who are blind, paralysed or crippled.

Following the Holy Rule of St Benedict, though not as Benedictines, the Sisters practise obedience to the extent of leaving their treatment in the hands of their Superiors without seeking to know the nature of the remedies applied. Each Sister has a share in the work, even though she may be bed-ridden, and all is carefully regulated by the Superiors who pay due consideration to the physical disabilities and to the capacities of all. In this way, the members of the Congregation are spared the strain which falls to the lot of the lay invalid who is only partially incapacitated, that of deciding the amount of the work she should undertake. Each house of the Congregation, whether it be one of the four Pories in France, the house in Holland or in the United States, is first and foremost a place where God is loved and adored, a place where His interests are of supreme importance. They are houses where sick and disabled Religious use their disabilities as means of fulfilling their vocation and offer all their suffering for the salvation of souls, and especially for Christ's priests and for their work as shepherds of His flock. Far from being dismal penitentiaries, the Pories are filled with Religious who have learnt to add to the "Amen" of resignation, the "Alleluia!" of joyous submission to the Will of God. The Pories serve as centres of encouragement to visitors to the Guest houses, to those who take part in the Days of Recollection organized by the Sisters or are linked to them through any of the organizations for which the Prioress-General is responsible.

The needs of the sick laity are catered for in several ways by the Congregation. Already a few have been received as Regular Oblates. Living in one or other of the Pories, these women undertake a more active apostolate, from which the enclosed Sisters are debarred, and, in addition, they care for the needs of the guests and carry on a correspondence with many who seek their help. Secular Oblates, living in their own homes and engaged, maybe, in the work of trade or profession, follow a rule of life in keeping with the spirit of the Order and maintain close contact with the Sisters. A wider circle still consists of invalids who are members of the Union of Jesus Crucified. The aim of this Union is to help its members "to submit readily and in perfect obedience to the Will of God manifested to them in the daily occurrence of their life and suffering, in the corporal

restrictions placed upon them in the orders of their physicians, and in the restraints and inabilities that are so hard to bear". By means of a light rule that will not be beyond the strength of any, and by a monthly letter from the Superior General, the spiritual health and well-being of the sick is established gradually and their power of serving Christ is prevented from going to waste. Finally, the Friends of the Sick welcome as members all, healthy and unhealthy alike, who are interested in the apostolate of the sick.

The Congregation is particularly well suited for its work of bringing new meaning into the lives of the Church's sick, for there is no invalidish subterfuge of which the Foundress and her Sisters are not aware. They know all the special temptations of the disabled, the tendency to indulge in self-pity, the attitude that regards one's own as the only valid suffering, the constant demands made on the time and patience of nurses, relatives and friends, and, perhaps worst of all, the feeling that in giving illness, God has given the invalid enough to bear and is harsh and over stern in pressing any other form of suffering upon him. Patients, and those who care for them, tend to look upon the sick as a race apart, people who have privileges but lack any form of duty. Those who have read *Clartés sur la Souffrance*, a collection of letters which were written by the Superior General of the Congregation of Jesus Crucified, will appreciate the tenderness, the humour and, withal, the candour with which she has exposed and rebuked the false thinking, the over-sensitivity and the selfishness to which the sick are prone. Far from being hurt by so ruthless an exposé of his pet failing, the invalid will be warmed by the spirit of maternal compassion which informs the writing, and the most over-sensitive of invalids could scarcely take the rebuke amiss.

It has been remarked by visitors to the Pories that the Sisters of Jesus Crucified appear to be particularly happy and unassuming. It is indeed the paradox of the Cross that, insofar as it is embraced with loving submission, its pain is eased and the suffering it causes is turned to joy. United with other invalids who lay their daily offering of pain at the foot of the Cross, rejoicing in their newly found capacity to serve God through their disabilities, offering their suffering for the work

of His priests, invalids who live in accordance with the spirit of this Congregation will bring joy to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and, through their misery and their weakness, will win many graces for the Church and especially for priests.

BRIDGET MARY WATERS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN AND CONFIRMATION

The priest in charge of a hospital can now administer Confirmation to those in danger of death, when neither the bishop nor the local parish priest is available. May he, under the same conditions, confirm those in danger of death who are in his parish, but are not patients in the hospital? (H. C. T.)

REPLY

Our correspondent has summarized somewhat loosely the contents of a rescript granted to the bishops of England and Wales, 24 November 1956, and valid for three years from that date. According to the version which we have seen, the faculty in question is much more precisely circumscribed. The petition, as reproduced in the rescript, referred only to maternity homes, homes for infants, and hospitals containing a section exclusively reserved to infants; and it requested that the power validly and lawfully to confirm children "therein received", in the circumstances defined by the decree *Spiritus sancti munera*, 14 September 1946, should be given to the chaplain of the said institutions and to any priest specially and stably charged with the spiritual care of the said children. The rescript granted what was asked, but subject to the following limitations: (a) The infants must be confirmed personally by the chaplain stably attached to the said hospitals, and, if there be several such chaplains, by the

principal one only, to the complete exclusion of the others.

(b) The chaplain cannot lawfully use this faculty, except when the bishop of the diocese is unobtainable or legitimately impeded from himself confirming, and no other bishop can supply for him without grave inconvenience, and the local parish priest is likewise unobtainable or legitimately impeded.

The second of these conditions is required only for the lawfulness of the Confirmation; but the first condition, since it determines the limits of the faculty, is certainly necessary to the validity. That this is so is further indicated in a subjoined statement to the effect that, if the chaplain, as above defined, is absent or unable to confirm personally, no other, except a bishop or the local parish priest can *validly* confer the sacrament.

The faculty is limited to the confirmation of children "therein received", i.e. in the institution of which the priest has charge. It is therefore certain that, even if the hospital is of the kind described in the petition and the priest in charge is a chaplain as defined, he cannot, *by virtue of this faculty*, lawfully or validly confirm any person, in danger of death, who is not a patient in the hospital, and indeed an infant patient.

The question implies, however, that the chaplain has parochial duties in addition to his hospital charge, for it asks whether he can confirm those in danger of death who are "in his parish, but are not patients in the hospital". The answer depends on the sense in which the parish is "his". If he is parish priest of the territory, or *vicarius actualis* (canon 471), or *vicarius oeconomicus* (canon 472), or has exclusive and stable charge of the territory with all the rights and duties of a parish priest, he can validly confirm any person in it, child or adult, who is in real danger of death from grave illness, and, if no bishop is available, lawfully also; but this, not in virtue of his hospital faculty, but in virtue of *Spiritus sancti munera*. If, on the other hand, he is a mere assistant or supply, he cannot lawfully or validly confirm anyone in the parish, adult or infant, but outside the hospital, either by virtue of his faculty, or by virtue of *Spiritus sancti munera*.¹

¹ For a fuller discussion of the case of the supply priest (*vicarius substitutus*), cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1957, p. 104.

BAPTISM DESIRED FOR SAKE OF CATHOLIC BURIAL

One sometimes hears of a non-Catholic husband or wife of a Catholic spouse expressing a desire for baptism, "so that we can be buried together". Prescinding from the question as to whether such a desire provides a title to ecclesiastical burial (canon 1239, §2), does it provide a sufficient ground for conferring baptism? (W. G. C.)

REPLY

Canon 752, §1: "Adultus, nisi sciens et volens probeque instructus, ne baptizetur; insuper admonendus est ut de peccatis suis doleat."

§2: "In mortis autem periculo, si nequeat in praecipuis fidei mysteriis diligentius instrui, satis est, ad baptismum conferendum, ut aliquo modo ostendat se eisdem assentire serioque promittat se christianae religionis mandata servaturum."

Three conditions are required for the valid and lawful reception of adult baptism: a deliberate will to receive the sacrament, due instruction leading to faith in the Christian revelation, and sorrow for sin. Of these, the first alone is necessary to the valid reception of the sacrament and impression of its distinctive character, the other two being required only for its fruitful and therefore lawful reception.¹ The intention to receive the sacrament must be positive, for Pope Benedict XIV rejected the teaching of Cajetan that a neutral state of mind suffices.² Moreover, according to the common doctrine, it must be more than a mere willingness to submit to the external rite, but must extend to the sacrament as such, i.e. as a sacred rite of regeneration or initiation into the Church. Thus the court of appeal of the *Vicariatus Urbis*, dealing recently with the marriage of a Muslim who, according to the evidence, received baptism merely in order to marry H., a wealthy and attractive Catholic

¹ Holy Office, 1 August 1860; Gasparri, *Fontes C.I.C.*, IV, n. 963, p. 236. So also canon 745, §2, 2°: "satis est ut suo quisque animi motu baptismum petat".

² Ep. *Postremo mense*, 28 February 1747, n. 48; Gasparri, *Fontes C.I.C.*, II, n. 377, p. 83.

girl, ruled that, even if his approach to baptism was not positively deceitful, "ad illum tamen accessisse constat mere materialiter, scilicet, non ut sacramentum regenerationis susciperet, sed solummodo ut externam caeremoniam, seu, ut ipsius utamur verbis, quamdam simplicem formalitatem, qua habilis putaretur ad matrimonium cum H. contrahendum"; and it concluded therefore that his baptism was invalid.¹

If therefore, in the case under consideration, there is good reason to believe that the non-Catholic spouse regards Catholic baptism as a mere formality which, though demanded as a prerequisite to Catholic burial, has no intrinsic spiritual effect for him, not even conditional (i.e. on the supposition that his previous baptism, if any, was invalid), and wills to receive it merely in order to qualify for Catholic burial with his wife, it is morally certain that the sacrament cannot be validly conferred and, *a fortiori*, that it cannot be lawfully conferred. If, on the other hand, having learnt that Catholic burial with his partner is dependent on his being a member of the Catholic Church and that he can become a member only by baptism, he is led to desire baptism as the sacred rite of incorporation into the Church, it seems probable that, however imperfect his motive, the sacrament would be validly received.

It does not, however, follow that it would be lawfully conferred. Much will depend, as is clear from canon 752, on his state of health. If he is physically and mentally capable of being duly instructed in the truths of the faith, he cannot lawfully be baptized until he has received the necessary degree of instruction and has declared his acceptance of all that the Church proposes as of faith, explicitly in regard to the principal truths, implicitly at least in regard to the rest. In danger of death, if time or other circumstances do not permit the normal degree of instruction, it can be cut to the minimum, but, while he remains in possession of his faculties, he cannot lawfully be baptized without some sort of expression of assent to the faith of the Catholic Church and a genuine promise to observe its precepts.

In neither case, therefore, does a mere desire of baptism,

¹ *Romana*, 30 May 1955, A. Paoletti *ponente*; *Ephemerides Iuris Canonici*, XII nn. 1-2, pp. 211-12.

"so that we can be buried together", provide a ground sufficient in itself for the lawful conferment of the sacrament on a person who remains in possession of his faculties. The most one can say is that it provides an opportunity of conversion which the priest should prudently seek to turn to good account, and that it would justify conditional baptism, in the hour of death, when consciousness has ceased.¹

Moreover, after death has ensued, a desire of the kind described might reasonably be considered sufficient ground for regarding the deceased as a catechumen, in the sense of canon 1239, §2, and therefore entitled to Catholic burial. The conditions required for this can be interpreted much more liberally than those for the lawful baptism of a conscious adult.²

DELEGATION OF CURATE TO DISPENSE FROM ABSTINENCE

Can a parish priest give a general delegation to his curate to dispense from abstinence any parishioner, or even any non-parishioner who has come into the parish to attend some such function as a dinner-dance, or must this delegation be limited to specific occasions such as the annual factory dinners at Christmas, which commonly occur on Friday evenings? (J. E. H.)

REPLY

"In individual cases and for a just cause," says canon 1245, §1, "parish priests can dispense from abstinence individual persons or families, even outside the parish territory if they are their subjects, and within it even *peregrini*."³ Since this dispensing power is attached to their sacred office by the law itself, it is *ordinary* power of jurisdiction.⁴ Now, according to canon 199,

¹ The condition should refer merely to the presence of a valid intention ("si capax es"), not to the presence of the right dispositions of faith and sorrow for sin.

² Cf. canon 1240, §2.

³ A *peregrinus* is a person who has a domicile or quasi-domicile somewhere else, but not in the place where he happens to be (canon 91).

⁴ "Potestas iurisdictionis ordinaria ea est quae ipso iure adnexa est officio; delegata, quae commissa est personae" (canon 197, §1).

§1, "one who has ordinary power of jurisdiction can delegate it to another in whole or in part, unless the law expressly provides otherwise". It provides otherwise in regard to the parish priest's ordinary power to hear confessions and preach,¹ but not in regard to his ordinary power of dispensing from abstinence. Hence, a parish priest can delegate this particular power to his curate in whole or in part, and, since it is not said that the delegation must be limited to single cases (as canon 199, §3, provides in regard to subdelegation of certain delegated powers) he is free to make the delegation general to all cases. It is true that, according to the common opinion of authors,² he cannot delegate the whole of his ordinary power permanently or indefinitely, because that would be equivalent to an unauthorized duplication of his office; but there would seem to be nothing to prevent his delegating an individual faculty, such as this dispensing power, without imposing a limitation as to length of time or number of cases.

Needless to say, however, he cannot delegate more power than he himself receives from the law. Since therefore, as stated in canon 1245, his own power is limited to dispensing individual persons and families in individual cases, any power which he may delegate to his curate must be subject to the same limitation. Authors vary somewhat in their interpretation of this restriction. On the one hand, it is certain that he cannot simply announce that he hereby dispenses any individual family or person, belonging to or visiting the parish, who may have occasion to attend an unspecified collective repast at which observance of the abstinence would prove unduly awkward, because, even if the required just cause were verified in each case, the mode of dispensation is of the general kind which is forbidden even to local Ordinaries, except in the two cases mentioned in canon 1245, §2. On the other hand, when the same just cause is shared by every member of a group, it is generally agreed that there is no need for each individual person or family to apply separately for a dispensation. In this case, as long as the parish priest or his delegate envisages only those

¹ Canon 873, §1, as interpreted by the Code Commission, 16 October 1919; and canon 1344, as qualified by canon 1337.

² Cf. e.g. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum*, II, n. 369; Beste, *Introductio in Codicem* (ed. 4), p. 225; Coronata, *Institutiones I.C.*, I, n. 288.

individuals who are to participate in a specified event, or share a specified hardship, he can dispense them all in a single act;¹ though some commentators incline to the view that he should at least require a list of the names of those concerned.² It is clear from the canon itself that he can include in a collectively granted dispensation of this kind any person actually present in the parish, even though not subject to him by domicile or quasi-domicile.

In each individual case, a just cause (e.g. an inconvenience which, though insufficient in itself to excuse from the obligation, is sufficient to justify the measure of indulgence involved) is required for the validity of the dispensation (canon 84, §1). We think that an annual factory dinner would normally provide a just cause. As to dinner-dances, much will depend on the importance of the individual occasion and therefore on the frequency with which such functions recur. However, "in doubt as to the sufficiency of the cause, a dispensation is lawfully sought and can lawfully and validly be granted" (canon 84, §2).

Within the limits above described, a parish priest can give general delegation to his curate to dispense parishioners and visitors from abstinence on specific occasions. The dispensation must be renewed on each separate occasion, but not necessarily the delegation of the curate to grant it.

L. L. McR.

BENEDICTION CANDLES

What is the present law about the number and quality of candles for Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament? Has there been a recent change in the law? (J. D.)

¹ "Nihil tamen obstat, quin ob causam sufficientem pluribus communem dispensatio his omnibus unico actu tribuatur. Talis dispensatio, licet virtualiter multiplex, potest adhuc censi singulis distributive data ideoque vere dici concessa in casibus singularibus."—Beste, *op. cit.*, p. 664. Cf. also Bride, *Ami du Clergé*, 21 July 1955, p. 465.

² E.g. Mahoney, *Questions and Answers*, II, n. 477; Conway, *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May 1957, p. 377.

REPLY

The first law about the number of candles for solemn Benediction, i.e. Benediction with the Sanctissimum exposed in the monstrance, was in 1879 when *S.R.C.*, in answer to a query permitted the number in very poor churches to be reduced to twelve for perpetual adoration (No. 3480). In 1910 the Congregation, asked if the view of "doctores liturgici" that six candles were sufficient for solemn exposition may be followed, referred the matter to the Ordinary "servatis decretis" (No. 4257¹). By a general decree of 13 March 1942, *S.R.C.* when, because of the war, beeswax could not be got or could be obtained only with great difficulty and cost, allowed Ordinaries, as long as war conditions lasted, to reduce the number of candles prescribed for different functions, and substitute other lights, even electric, to bring the number up to that required. The Congregation did not specify the minimum number of candles that must be used in these circumstances. Finally, on 18 August 1949 came another general decree of *S.R.C.*—the latest on the subject—which determined definitely the extent of the indult granted in 1942. Because of the cost of beeswax, it permits the Ordinary to reduce the number of wax candles for solemn exposition to four, the balance of the correct number to be supplied by other lights. *S.R.C.* then urges Ordinaries to restore the "veneranda saecularis traditio" about the candles as soon as possible. When this decree was issued rubricians were teaching that twelve was the minimum number of candles for Benediction (except, perhaps, in very poor churches), and so this must be accepted as the "tradition" in this matter. The decree did not determine what the "other lights" were to be, so this must be settled by previous legislation (i) oil lamps on the altar are ruled out (*S.R.C.*, 3173); (ii) the candles prescribed for exposition must be—by a ruling of the bishops of England and Wales¹ in 1906, giving an authentic interpretation to a decision of *S.R.C.* (No. 4147) of 1904 about the quality of candles used for cultual purposes—at least 65 per cent wax;¹

¹ The bishops of Ireland in 1905 ordered the candles for exposition to be at least 25 per cent wax.

accordingly, the "other lights" over and above the four 65 per cent wax candles may be candles of 25 per cent wax; or (iii) the balance of the lights may, in the last resort, be electric, but these may not be *on* the altar itself nor on its gradines (if there are any), according to *S.R.C.*, 4086, 4097, 4206, 4210, 4322. The present law, then, about Benediction candles depends in each diocese on the decision of the Ordinary, whether he abides by the traditional law of a minimum of twelve wax candles, or permits, in virtue of the indult of 1949, the number to be reduced to four "with other lights". In England and Wales the general law is laid down in the official *Ritus Servandus* (§3), and this stipulates that at least twelve wax candles are to be used. In the latest edition of the *Ritus* (1955) no change has been made in this, and so it must be presumed that this ruling still obtained in England and Wales, unless any Ordinary prescribes otherwise for his diocese.

The Clementine Instruction, in any diocese where it is in force, requires (§ vi) at least twenty candles for the Forty Hours' Prayer; and a very old decision (1602) of the then Congregation of Bishops and Regulars prescribes six candles for private (ciborium) Benediction.

COLLECTAE IMPERATAE

The new rubrics (V, 4) legislate for only *Collectae ab Ordinaria simpliciter imperatae*, and say nothing about those *pro re gravi*, what is the present law about these? Are they subject to the "rule of three" (III, 3)? (R. R. S.)

REPLY

The order of a prayer prescribed *pro re gravi* is after any imperative commemoration or a prayer specially prescribed by the rubrics (e.g. the prayer for the Pope or bishop on the anniversary of his election or consecration; the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament to be said at an altar of Exposition), but before ordinary commemorations. It is subject to the rule of

three of *D.G.R.S.*,¹ III, 3, for *commemorationes* in this section is to be taken in the widest sense and embraces every kind of prayer that can occur in the Mass, and not only commemorations in the strict sense (*S.R.C.*, 2 June 1955, ad 4). If, then, there are in any Mass three prayers prescribed by the rubrics (commemorations—imperative or ordinary—or such prayers as that for the Pope or bishop on their anniversaries, or the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament) and there is also a collect *pro re gravi* prescribed by the Ordinary the third of the commemorations or special prayers is then omitted, and the collect said in the third place (*S.R.C.*, 3 November 1955, ad xix; 16 June 1956, ad 6). According to the existing law a collect *pro re gravi* is omitted only on: (a) a double of the first class; (b) a Sunday of the first class; (c) the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost; (d) all the days of Holy Week.² It is not omitted on the days of the octaves of Easter and Pentecost which are not doubles of the first class, for “Commemorationes” has not the wider meaning in *D.G.R.S.*, II, 12, that it has in III, 3; nor is it omitted during the Christmas octave.

ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION

Is the prayer for the celebrant himself on the anniversary of his ordination affected by the new rubrics and is it subject to the “rule of three”? (R. R. S.)

REPLY

Yes! It is now excluded during all the days of Holy Week,² and it is subject to the “rule of three” of *D.G.R.S.*, III, 3. Its place is as previously after all prayers prescribed by the rubrics (Additiones, VI, 3) but before *collectae simpliciter imperatae*.

J. B. O’C.

¹ Decree *Cum nostra* of 23 March 1955 for the Simplification of the Rubrics.

² *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae*, Decretum, I, 3.

BOOK REVIEWS

Iurisprudentia Pontificia: De Metu. By D. Lazzarato. Pp. liv + 1380. (D'Auria, Naples, 1956. £5 15s. 6d., cloth-bound.)

As can be readily seen from a glance at the annually published list of matrimonial causes decided by the Sacred Roman Rota, *vis vel metus* is the ground of nullity most commonly alleged. Since most of these causes originate in diocesan tribunals, it follows that these tribunals must frequently be called upon to decide whether an alleged motive of fear was sufficient, in kind and degree, to nullify a matrimonial contract. It can never be easy to pass judgement on such fear, because so much depends on purely subjective factors which escape the direct light of external evidence. Nor is it easy to define it, except by case-law; so that the mind of the legislator is more clearly revealed in judicial assessments of actual situations than in the abstract texts of the law.

For this reason, Fr Lazzarato, an advocate in the Roman curia, has, in this massive volume, undertaken the immense task of selecting and summarizing no less than six hundred and twenty-two cases (three dealing with ordination and the rest with marriage) which were solved, at least ultimately, by pontifical tribunals between the years 1910 and 1945. The cases are grouped under their respective *ponentes* in chronological order. Each is headed by a brief descriptive title and contains a résumé of the case, the decision and the arguments of law and fact on which it was based, interspersed with animadversions by the author. Some of these are sharply critical, as for example his comment on the Marlborough-Vanderbilt case: "*Legitima igitur non videtur sententiae conclusio, probationem fieri per duos testes omni exceptione maiores, cum sint nimis vagi in se, neque cum actrice congruere videantur. Testes ex officio auditi non sint. Ex parte viri conventi nullus auditus est testis*" (p. 696). It is thus not merely a work of compilation that he has achieved, but one of critical assessment.

To enable the reader to find his way around amid this vast mass of material, the author has provided, in addition to a fifty-page table of contents, more than one hundred pages of analytical indices, in which the material is broken down into categories, and the principles and arguments involved are dissected under alphabetically arranged headings. Any tribunal, therefore, that consults this book in order to learn from cases, situations, or arguments analogous to those with which they are called to deal, should have no difficulty in achieving their quest; though the author might have helped them

more, had his source-references been a little more explicit. In the copy sent for review, there are sixteen blank pages, a whole sheet having apparently been printed on one side only; but, to judge from the table of corrected *errata*, they were not blank in the author's copy.

Marriage and the Family. By F. J. Sheed. Pp. 77.

Confession. By John C. Heenan, Bishop of Leeds. Pp. 95.

(Sheed & Ward. Canterbury Books, II and III. 3s. 6d. each, paper-bound.)

THESE attractively produced little books are respectively the second and third of a series, the purpose of which is to provide "short, intelligent, informative guide-books to the essentials of Catholic teaching". Many of them are to be extracts or abridgements of existing books, but others will be specially written.

Mr Sheed's *Marriage and the Family* is the central portion of his *Society and Sanity* which has already met with wide acclaim. In the first of its three chapters, he shows how the turbulent impetuosity of the sexual instinct is harnessed to its orderly and noble purpose in marriage; in the second, he draws the doctrinal conclusions of the truth that, although matrimonial contracts are made by men and women, the relationship and properties of marriage itself are the work of God alone; and in the third, he discusses the factors which make or mar "marriage existential". The whole bears witness to the author's exceptional didactic clarity and psychological insight.

The same qualities are evinced by Bishop Heenan's *Confession*, which is an abridgement of his well known *Priest and Penitent*. This fact may account for one or two slight inaccuracies noted. Thus, contrary to his summary statement on page 78, there may well be an obligation to confess having taken something, even when there is no obligation to restore; and the principle of probabilism is not limited to "doubtful positive law" (p. 83). It is however a commendable achievement to have compressed so much dogmatic, moral and pastoral theology into so small a space, without subjecting the reader to mental indigestion.

If the series maintains this level, it should be of great help in the instruction of converts. These two booklets could equally well serve as the basis of talks, or as complementary reading for the more intelligent catechumen.

Le Sacrement de la Pénitence. By Paul Anciaux. Pp. 168. (Editions Nauwelaerts, Louvain, 1957. Paper-bound, 80 fr. belges.)

No treatise of theology is more dependent on an accurate knowledge of its historical antecedents than that which deals with the nature

and effects of the sacrament of Penance. M. l'Abbé Anciaux has already given evidence of his special competence in this historical field by his magistral dissertation, *La Théologie du sacrement de Pénitence au XII^e Siècle*. In the present work, smaller and less specialist, but far from superficial, he applies his expert knowledge in a wider examination of the whole subject, his principal theme being that penance is efficacious only in union with the Church, is perfected only by an "acte ecclésial", and is sacramental in that, through this act, the sinner is reconciled to God by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

After a survey of the stages through which, during the first eleven centuries, the institution of ecclesiastical penance, part canonical, part sacramental, evolved into its present form, he discusses its sacramental character, showing how this is expressed both in the free and conscious acts of the penitent (the material element) and in the intervention of the priest as minister of the Church (the formal element). In his third chapter, on interior repentance, he adopts the unified Thomist explanation of the manner in which the sinner's change of heart leads to justification, rejecting the Scotist distinction between two ways of justification and deprecating any concept of the sacrament which treats it as supplying from the outside for defects in the interior repentance of the sinner. He then shows how the exterior manifestation of the sinner's change of heart is taken up and consecrated by the intervention of the Church as a constitutive element of a grace-giving sacrament. Finally, after an analysis of the sacramental efficacy of penance, which is largely a summary of the findings of his book, he deals in an appendix with the origins and meaning of indulgences.

The book is not a substitute for the normal treatise *De Poenitentia*, as found in a course of theology, dogmatic or moral. Rather is it a *mise au point*, an effort to put the various elements of that treatise in what the author conceives to be their proper perspective, by viewing them against their historical background and in the light of the Thomist synthesis. It does not lend itself to easy reading, and the argument is somewhat repetitive, but both these features are largely attributable to the intrinsic obscurity of the subject.

L. L. McR.

Henry Morse, Priest of the Plague. By Philip Caraman. (Longmans. 18s. net.)

THERE were a great many poor Catholics in London in the middle years of the reign of Charles I; crowds heard Mass at the Queen's chapel at Somerset House. Fr Blunt, the Jesuit Provincial, had

thirty priests at work and the number of seculars may have been equal or greater. Then in 1635 the plague came to London. Its worst ravages were in the poorest and most overcrowded districts, St Giles-in-the-Fields, Holborn, Shoreditch, Stepney and White-chapel. Ghastly conditions of squalor and filth were made still worse by the absurd measures taken by the authorities: "every house where lies anyone who has been visited by the plague to be shut up and watched day and night". To escape was treated as crime. Bon-fires burned in the streets and fires were kept up incessantly indoors, windows sealed and even keyholes blocked. Over all reigned an atmosphere of panic and hysteria. Protestants in general attributed the visitation to Popery, the Puritans to the semi-idolatrous Anglican ritual.

Catholics, not being registered parishioners and eligible for relief, had to provide for themselves and for one another. Priests had to bring relief for the living as well as the Last Sacraments to the dying. Two of the most conspicuous apostles were Henry Morse, S.J., and John Southworth, the chosen representative of the Secular Chapter. A sharp dissension arose between them on the question of faculties, instigated by one Peter Fitton who had quarrelled with the Jesuits before. The latter had been receiving their faculties direct from Rome and this had not been questioned until in 1624 it was disputed by Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon. Eventually in 1636 Morse and Southworth co-operated in issuing a Joint Appeal "to the Catholickes of England" (signed J. S. and H. M.), and under the patronage of the Queen money came in generously. A magistrate, before whom Morse was brought, said to him: "We are all aware that the Catholics of London are more generous to their sick than we Protestants."

The whole story of Morse's life (1595-1645) is another instance of how truth outdoes fiction, and, like that of other martyrs of that time, is a vivid piece of social history. In various respects his story is typical. The younger son of a Norfolk gentleman, educated at Cambridge and Gray's Inn, he was actually converted by what he had seen at the trials of priests. He crossed to Flanders and entered the English seminary at Douai. Returning as a priest he was at once arrested, and spent four years in the New Prison at Southwark, and then found himself among a batch of priests released and banished in 1618. At Rome he became a Jesuit. Again in England, he laboured at Newcastle where Catholics were numerous, was imprisoned at York and again exiled. He returned to the London district in 1633 and it was there that he earned the designation of "the Plague Priest". Betrayed and arrested, he defended himself so

adroitly at the Old Bailey that the judge had to explain to the jury that Morse was accused of two things: of "perverting His Majesty's subjects from their allegiance" and of being a priest; and that on the first charge there was not a scrap of evidence. On the second, however, he was found guilty. The Queen was approached, through the envoy George Con, and Charles I reprieved and released him. He was rearrested, brought before Laud in the Court of High Commission, but Laud could only send him back to Newgate, an act which figured as one of the charges against that prelate when he himself came to be tried. Released again by order of the King, Morse went back to the North and was caught again and in 1644 brought to London. There, where there was no longer a King to protect him, he was by order of the Parliament executed, merely for his priesthood, on the strength of the conviction in 1637.

The book is well illustrated from contemporary prints, while an Appendix of Sources provides authority and references for all the copious details of a very interesting and vivid narrative.

Frontiers in American Catholicism: Essays on Ideology and Culture. By Walter J. Ong, S.J. (The Macmillan Co. of New York. \$2.50.)

In these essays Fr Ong, an active member of the learned American world and the author of more than one hundred articles in various periodicals, has presumably meant to comply with a recent request by the editors of *La Vie Intellectuelle* that American Catholics should write books about themselves for the information of Europeans. It would, of course, be difficult to convey very much on so large a subject in one hundred and twenty-four pages; but more information could have been given but for the author's strong propensity for generalization—and always in severely philosophical terms. The European who has no great knowledge of American life can hardly be aware of the innumerable facts and details on which all these general statements are based, and he soon calls to mind the remark of the American philosopher, William James, that nobody can see further into a generalization than his own knowledge of the details extends. To take one instance out of scores, the reader is told that the historical sense is lacking in the general American Catholics consciousness (which has avoided all but a captious acquaintance with Hegelianism), and that there is an obvious discrepancy between this absence of an historical sense and a mode of life which, with some *éclat*, is living an evolution into the future. And indeed there is much more which might even daunt the votary of Summer Schools. With some relief we learn that the simple reason why scouting—a product of romanticism on the level of practical sociology—is accepted

with reluctance is because it keeps the boys away from non-Catholic troops.

It is among the *obiter dicta* that the simple European will find scraps of information and sidelights. The Church finds optimism, that very general American characteristic, to be one of the most ready points of entry into the American sensibility. Fr Ong considers nostalgic mediaevalism to be a hallmark of Catholics in the United States and that their intellectual effort remains mediaeval in focus and interest by comparison not only with the Protestants but with European Catholics. The relative isolationism resulting from complete academic freedom in Catholic colleges and schools, due to the absence of any State support or control, is offset by their own standardization. "Here the Church," writes Fr Ong, "was, as in no European country, formed by the post-Tridentine seminary training and its orientations are the product of Trent rather than of the complex agglomerate of customs and observances such as one finds in European Catholic history or in that of Latin America." Observances and devotions in the U.S.A. are somewhat different: there is no great use of processions and, outside French and Spanish spheres of influence, practically no tradition of *local* saints or devotions.

The longest and most concrete of the six essays, that on the Renaissance, explains its reaction against mediaevalism as not being by any means confined to theology but extending to medicine, physics and to whatever there was of positive knowledge. A plea is made for "a new humanism", but the author gives no very clear outline of what he desiderates.

One observation, in the last section, is almost humorous. What the ancient world knew as "rhetoric" or "oratory", the art of swaying other men conceived as the crown of all education, has now migrated from the faculties of languages into the university courses in "advertising", "marketing" and "salesmanship"; but Fr Ong swiftly recovers himself to add that the remedy for this would be "to bring to bear on this area of personalist activity the phenomenological analysis closely connected with European personalism".

Rafael, Cardinal Merry Del Val. By Marie Cecilia Buehrle. (Sands & Co. 18s. net.)

THE author of this biography explains that "there is neither footnote nor chapter heading, index nor bibliography" in order to enable the reader "to walk more freely and easily through the years in company with the Cardinal". We are seldom in company with anybody else except St Pius X, Mgr (now cardinal) Canali, and a personal friend named Ross, who appears throughout the book as

"Don Felice". In a spirit of single-minded and whole-hearted hero-worship Miss Buehrle eliminates almost everything but the personal and private aspects of her subject's life, and despite the conventional disclaimer relating to Causes of Beatification she has resolutely constructed her own stained-glass window in the brightest colours. The tone is that of the eye-witness. Sometimes Rafael pales; at other times his eyes light up with a smile of welcome. At the conclave of 1903 the eyes of Cardinal Puzyna narrowed and his lips tightened, when told that the Austrian vote would not be welcomed. With a minimum of information about the events in which Cardinal Merry Del Val took part there is almost as much insistence on his attractive and distinguished appearance as on his virtues and merits. While nobody would question the perfect suitability on every ground of his appointment as Legate for the Assisi celebrations of 1926, it may be permissible to entertain a doubt whether the Franciscans now regard Fonte Colombo as doubly sacred because he was fond of praying there.

The question of the succession to the see of Westminster in 1903 is treated here as something that did not really concern Merry Del Val at all, although it is plain enough from the foregoing pages that he had been intended for that office. What "the English Catholic peer considered his duty" to represent to the Pope, viz. that a Spanish name and background was a disqualification for that particular post, was in fact a widely held opinion. Gasquet is only once mentioned and then in connexion with the Commission on Anglican Orders. The affairs of France are very cursorily treated. There is no mention of Cardinal Mathieu or of Mgr Duchesne. Similarly, about Modernism; the only names mentioned are those of Tyrrell and Loisy; there is not a word about Cardinal De Lai or Cardinal Billot. The conclave of 1914 is passed over completely; the only significance of it, one would infer, was that it brought about the retirement of Cardinal Merry Del Val. The names of Maffi, Ferrata and Gasparri will not be found here; and Cardinal Bourne hardly appears at all in the narrative. Miss Buehrle's only comment on the eleven years' administration of Merry Del Val is to quote the saying of the Pope: *La politica della Chiesa è di non fare politica*, which was echoed by the Secretary of State: "there is not a shred of politics in the attitude of the Holy See". That, however, is what some of the critics complained of. Too much is left out, in favour of the Boys' Club in the Trastevere and of long private letters to personal friends. That, however, is the author's chosen method and she manages to fill 300 pages without troubling very much about the events and personalities of the time.

There are sixteen pages of photographs and a genial Foreword by Archbishop Heenan, who describes his own first meeting with Merry Del Val at St Peter's. The Cardinal Archpriest was very gracious to the new student and gave him some excellent advice.

Cardinal von Galen. By the Rev. H. Portmann. Translated, adapted, and with an Introduction by R. L. Sedgwick. (Jarrolds. 21s. net.)

THE English edition of this loyal and reverential biography of "The Lion of Munster" by his devoted chaplain owes a great deal to Brigadier-General Sedgwick as well in matter as in form. The general first met the future cardinal in 1939 when on service at the Vatican as a Privy Chamberlain to His Holiness and then, most fortunately, when the Occupation began, having been appointed Controller-General of Religious Affairs for the British Zone. The official relations were almost from the outset facilitated and enriched by a remarkable friendship, for it was remembered that von Galen's powerful and fearless opposition to Hitlerism had been of no small use to British propagandists, while on the other hand something was done if not to soften, at least to explain, the difficulties of the Occupation to the bewildered Germans. As a patriotic German and as shepherd of his flock, the bishop's attitude to the British was almost equally resolute and critical; yet, while he had some unanswerable complaints, he always recognized the essential moderation of the British High Command and was grateful to Brigadier Sedgwick who in daily intercourse smoothed away many difficulties. But for incredible exertions on the part of the Brigadier, seconded by the courtesy and active kindness of the American and French authorities, the two cardinals-elect, von Galen of Munster and von Preysing of Berlin, would never have reached Rome for the Consistory of 1946.

Clemens Augustus von Galen came from a noble Westphalian family of the strongest military and clerical traditions. Brought up in Spartan fashion in an intensely Catholic atmosphere he represented the conservative and patriarchal standpoint and was the visible embodiment of it all. A giant in stature, he was equally conspicuous by his appearance and bearing. The family motto: *nec laudibus nec timore* exactly expressed the man. Appointed bishop of Munster in 1939 he made no secret of his opinion of the Nazi regime and before the war began he was already a marked man. They had made up their minds to kill him, but because of his immense popularity and prestige they dared not do it during the struggle, for that would have put the whole of Westphalia out of the German war-effort.

During the war Munster suffered frightfully; four-fifths of the city, including the episcopal residence, was destroyed, and at last the bishop was forced to go away to an obscure place to carry on the work of the diocese. By the time he got to Rome in 1946 he was almost worn out; but he immediately toured the P.O.W. camps of Southern Italy, even as far as Taranto, where he procured, or expedited, the release of many of his beloved Westphalians and Rhinelanders. He then went back to his diocese and died exactly one month after receiving the red biretta. On all who came in contact with him he left an unforgettable impression.

The early chapters of the book are much abridged, but the Appendix contains long extracts from the famous sermons in which the great bishop and patriot denounced "the Satanic system". There are no fewer than eighteen interesting illustrations.

J. J. DWYER

Jus Pontificalium, Introductio in Caeremoniale Episcoporum. By Joachim Nabuco. Pp. 23 + 404. (Desclée, 1956. 23s.)

MONSIGNOR NABUCO, Protonotary Apostolic, and a Consultor of the S. Congregation of Rites, is a rubrician of high standing, and is known the world over especially through his magnificent commentary on the Roman Pontifical, *Pontificalis Romani Expositio Juridico-Practica* (three volumes), published in 1945.

Prelates and all who have to come into contact with them will warmly welcome this new, invaluable book of Mgr Nabuco. Even the most competent master of ceremonies—not to mention harassed rectors of churches not too well acquainted with pontifical rites—may, at times, find it difficult to solve knotty problems of precedence, the use of a throne, the attendance of assistant deacons and all the rest, problems that must needs be solved lest the modesty of a prelate be offended by receiving honours to which he is not entitled or his dignity be ruffled by denying him his due.

Mgr Nabuco deals faithfully with all prelates from cardinals to Monsignori di Mantellone (who, if not technically prelates, do hover about just outside the charmed circle). None escape his attention from the Patriarch of Lisbon, who enjoys almost papal ceremonial privileges to the Archbishop of Armagh, whose primacy of all Ireland (writes Mgr Nabuco) "has been confirmed by a constant tradition and was recognized by the Vatican Council" (p. 43), and who is accustomed to wear (like the Patriarch of Lisbon) a pectoral cross with a double traverse, which neither the Pope nor any other patriarch uses or has ever used (p. 191).

In the first book of his commentary Mgr Nabuco deals with the

varying ranks of prelates; in the second book with their dress, vestments and insignia, and their liturgical privileges. A section of this part is concerned with the chief churches of Rome and with cathedrals; and there are some interesting pages on prelatical heraldry.

Book III treats of pontifical functions in general, not in detail, which is a matter for books on ceremonial. There is a good bibliography, with instructive notes on the various writers, and there is a synoptic index, an analytical index and an index of places and persons. It is interesting to note that Mgr Nabuco refers several times to Westminster Cathedral, always with admiration and praise.

It is quite evident that Mgr Nabuco has an unrivalled knowledge of matters pontifical and is very widely read, even in English. As he is a consultor of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and his book has been read in proof by such experts as Fathers Frederick Vier, O.F.M., Hannibal Bugnini, C.M., and Joseph Narciso dos Santos, C.M.F., it is a treatise of unusual authority. For those interested in ecclesiastical ceremonial it is a book of inestimable value, crammed with erudite, useful and accurate information—a book of absorbing interest to prelates and all concerned with them.

A Commentary on the New Little Office. By Rev. John J. Kugler, S.D.B. Pp. xxix + 209. (Salesiana Publishers and Distributors, Paterson, New Jersey, 1955 [?]. Price not stated.)

THE dating of this book is perplexing. There is no date on the title-page, none on the *imprimatur*. After the latter comes "Copyright, 1955", while the Foreword (p. xv) is dated "Feast of our Lady of Lourdes, 1951". The dating is not unimportant, as the book is a commentary on the "new" Little Office, but what is the *new* Little Office? In 1953 an entirely new one, edited by Fr Bea, S.J.—well known in connexion with the new Latin translation of the Psalter—appeared, and its use was approved by the Pope for those who recite daily the Office of our Lady. However, the text commented on by Fr Kugler is, evidently, that found in the Roman Breviary. He uses the excellent translation of the Psalms made by members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America from the original Hebrew text in 1950, and adds to each psalm and canticle very interesting explanations and observations, with spiritual "reflexions" thrown in for good measure. The psalms are prefaced by the English version of the Apostolic Letter *In Cotidianis Precibus* of Pius XII, introducing the new Latin text of the Psalter (1945), and some useful information on Hebrew poetry. The indulgences mentioned for the recitation of the Little Office (p. xv) would need to be brought up to date in

accordance with *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum*, n. 318. The commentary should prove helpful to the religious and pious laity who use the Little Office.

J. B. O'C.

The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism. By Louis Bouyer. Translated by A. V. Littledale. Pp. xiii + 234. (The Harvill Press. 18s.)

THE first value of this book lies in its method. We forget too often that it is truth not error that attracts. When a person cherishes a false religion or opinion, it is not what is false in it that holds him; some truth is what he is clinging to, and he maintains the errors because he wrongly thinks that they are inseparably connected with the truth that moves him to assent. Why does he continually resist our arguments? More often than not, because the truth dear to him is not properly represented in the statement we offer. What is wanted is not a mere refutation of errors, but an effort to enlarge our own understanding of the truths we hold, so that full justice is done to those elements that our opponents insist upon and we have sometimes neglected. As Fr de Broglie remarks in his preface to the book:

Actually, we are too much inclined to blame the blind obstinacy of our opponents for the failure of our arguments to convince them, whereas this is often due to the narrowness of our aims and vision, even, nay especially, when we have recourse to the utterances of authority to conceal our defects of methods (p. ix).

What then does Fr Bouyer do in this book? He sets forth the positive principles of Protestantism and shows their value. He then disengages them from the negative elements that led the Reformers into heresy. His conclusion is that only in the Catholic Church can the positive insights so fostered in the religious life of Protestants find their authentic expression and unimpeded development.

Despite first appearances, Protestantism is, the author insists, a positive movement. It lives by positive principles and values, and to understand it one must grasp it as a living religion. Fr Bouyer is himself a convert from Protestantism, and he is able in the first part of the book to lead the reader to a sympathetic understanding of the positive side of the Protestant tradition. To follow his exposition is an enlightening experience. He gives as the true basic principle of Protestantism the gratuitousness of salvation. He examines it as found in the *sola gratia* of Luther, traces its influence in Protestant

spirituality, and then shows that it is Catholic. Next comes a discussion of Calvin's contribution, namely, the deep sense of the sovereignty of God. The *solī Deo gloria* of Calvin is analysed, and its place in the life of Protestantism explained. That insight too is Catholic, if we take what is primary and essential in it. Reflexion on the basic principle of the Reformation is then rounded off by a chapter on the significant role given to personal religion in the outlook of the Reformers; a similar stress was found in the Counter-Reformation. The author then turns to the second principle of Protestantism, the sovereign authority of the Scriptures. Once more he is concerned to bring into full relief all that is of value in the Protestant appreciation of the Bible:

In the first place, there is no doubt that Luther's insistence on the Bible and its supreme authority did not, in the first instance, signify to him or the Protestants in general a denial of tradition or the authority of the Church; it was in fact a spiritual rediscovery immensely rich in results (p. 117).

His account includes an appreciation of Barth's theology of the Word of God, and an insistence of the place of the Bible in Catholic tradition. His remarks on this latter theme are strengthened by a note by Fr de Broglie at the end of the book on the primacy of the argument from Scripture in theology. Thus, there is put before the reader in six instructive chapters the riches of Protestantism.

Fr Bouyer then looks at the negative elements that caused the movement of reform to end in heresy. Here his criticism is severe, almost too merciless, and no one could upbraid him with lack of awareness of Protestant errors and defects. What was the source of these weeds that choked the good seed? He finds it in the nominalism of the late Middle Ages:

Our conclusion from this chapter is that the negative, "heretical" aspect of the Reformation neither follows from its positive principles, nor is it a necessary consequence of their development or vindication, but appears simply as a survival, within Protestantism, of what was most vitiated and corrupt in the Catholic thought of the close of the Middle Ages (p. 164).

This connexion with nominalism should have been worked out much more fully. The failure to do this is a weak point in the structure of the book. The next chapter follows the sad story of the decay of the positive principles; the way they were strangled by the false

principles of nominalism. Yet Protestantism remained a living religion, and this fact is dealt with by an account of the Protestant revivals, which were due to the attempts to free the positive principles from their negative bonds. The examination of this chequered history prepares the way for the argument that the Catholic Church is necessary for the full flowering of the principles of the Reformation. An endeavour is made to remove Protestant misunderstanding of Catholic teaching and to lead the Protestant reader to the realization to which the author himself was brought, that only in the Catholic Church can the authentically Christian values of the Reformation find their proper expansion.

Unusual and paradoxical though the author's approach may seem, there is no trace here of superficially smart dialectic. It is a very attractive book, sincere, sympathetic and genuine in its appeal. It treats the Reformation too exclusively as a doctrinal movement. It is a fine analysis of the doctrinal issues as such, but how far can one abstract from the confused welter of factors, events and personalities that these involved in their concrete reality? All the same, it is a book that is to be valued and warmly recommended for the insight it gives. The translation is good.

Sacraments and Worship: Liturgy and Doctrinal Development of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. Edited with commentary by Paul F. Palmer, S.J., S.T.D. Pp. xxiv + 336. (Sources of Christian Theology, 1. Longmans, Green & Co. 15s.)

THIS book first appeared in the United States in 1955, and it was then reviewed in these pages (XL, 1955, pp. 603-4). A comparison of the two editions has revealed no changes in the text, except in the General Foreword and the Preface. These have been modified with an eye to non-Catholic readers. Happily so, since in their previous form they were clumsily inconsiderate. A change, and a most striking one, has taken place in the format. The large inch-thick volume of 9 ins. by 6 ins. has become a slender half-inch thing of 6½ by 4½. With its thin paper and new-style binding in plastic material, the English edition is a handy and neat little volume. It is also much cheaper than its American counterpart.

The new look of the book prompts one to add a comment to those already made. Would it not be possible to include the original text of at least the Latin documents? Serious study, at the seminary let alone the university level, is impossible without some consultation of the originals. The average student needs the help of translations, but these can be of most service opposite the original text. Are we not encouraging slipshod work by productions such as this?

The Roots of the Reformation. By Karl Adam. Pp. 95. (Canterbury Books, 1. Sheed & Ward. 3s. 6d.)

THIS is the first of the new and promising series *Canterbury Books*, which will provide short guide-books to Catholic teaching. It substantially reproduces the work *One and Holy*, published in 1954. Various cuts have been made. The largest is in the last chapter, and the governing principle seems to have been to omit the paragraphs concerned with the practical approach to the problem of reunion. As the new title indicates, the book now stands as an analysis of the background and causes of the Reformation. The modification has been successfully carried out.

The work in its first form was reviewed in these pages (XL, 1955, pp. 166-8). Its value and the excellence of the translation were acknowledged, but it was criticized for a lack of balance in the presentation of the Reformation background. That criticism may still be made. Is it entirely suitable as an opening to the series? One wonders. There is at least this to its credit—it does make the reader think.

C. D.

Wittgenstein and the Cult of Language. By D. J. B. Hawkins, D.D., Ph.D. Pp. 14. (Aquinas Paper No. 27. Blackfriars Publications. 1s. 6d.)

OF all the Cambridge philosophers of this century, Wittgenstein has exercised on British philosophy an influence only exceeded by Moore and Russell, yet during his life-time he published only one work, the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. This appeared in 1921, and to the uninitiated observer it must have seemed no more intelligible than the phenomenon known as Dadaism which was seeking expression at that time in art and poetry. The first exhibition of Dadaist "art" took place at night in a cellar with the lights out. In a somewhat similar way Wittgenstein prefaced his *Tractatus* with the remark that only a few would ever understand it, and at the end he suggested that those few who had understood it should reject his propositions as meaningless; after its publication he indicated that he was no longer satisfied with some, at least, of those propositions, but what they were he confided to only a few, and the posthumous publication of his *Philosophical Investigations* added little fresh information. In the face of such discouragement the ordinary mortal might well decide to go his own way and let Wittgenstein and his disciples go theirs—after all, his *Tractatus* had ended with the warning: "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent." But the extent of his influence is undeniable, and many will admit the need to understand

the main lines, if no more, of the trend in philosophy that he has sponsored. Canon Hawkins has met this need in a paper read before the Aquinas Society of London and now published by Blackfriars. Within a brief compass he expounds the aims and method of Wittgenstein and leads us expertly through the maze of that philosopher's thought; of particular interest is his assessment of the current movement in British philosophy as a return to the positions of traditional philosophy, a return to which Wittgenstein contributed despite himself. In recent years Canon Hawkins has read many papers before philosophical societies and has contributed a number of articles to various periodicals. It is good to hear that soon a selection of these will be collected together and published in one volume.

Rosmini on Human Rights. By C. J. Emery, Inst. Ch., M.A. Pp. 29. (Aquinas Paper No. 28. Blackfriars Publications. 2s.)

THERE is abundant evidence to show that Antonio Rosmini, the illustrious founder of the Institute of Charity, was among the leaders in the first attempts of the nineteenth century to restore scholasticism to its rightful place in philosophy; but a glance through the history of those attempts—for instance, Van Riet's massive study of Thomist Epistemology—will show that Rosmini's work has not been accepted as a positive contribution to that restoration; instead, his philosophy has been neglected and most of the manuals have consigned him to a place "among the adversaries". This is due in part to Rosmini's own admission that he differed from Malebranche in details only and not in fundamentals; but it is chiefly due to the central, unifying doctrine of his philosophy: the human mind, said Rosmini, has an initial innate intuition of the idea of being.

In this short paper, read before the Aquinas Society of London, Fr Emery gives an able exposition of Rosmini's teaching on the rights that belong to the human person, and its logical application in the functions of civil society. The attention of the reader is likely to be diverted, however, to the implications of Rosmini's belief that moral rights and duties are to be deduced ultimately from the doctrine of innate ideas, and in particular to Fr Emery's contention that "evidently St Thomas held that the principles of reasoning are innate". As he says, it is unsafe to argue from isolated quotations from St Thomas, yet these quotations seem to Fr Emery to justify him in his conclusion that "It is more difficult to disregard the text that favours Rosmini than to interpret the unfavourable text in a Rosminian sense." It should be pointed out, however, that those

Thomistic philosophers, who have considered the difficulty raised by these ambiguous texts, are generally agreed that St Thomas firmly rejected the doctrine of innate ideas; while his remarks about our innate knowledge of first principles are to be understood as referring, not to the principles themselves, but instead to the *intellectus agens*, whose light enables us to make the initial abstraction by which those principles are known.

Cosmology for All. By Edwin Rabbitte, O.F.M. Pp. 122. (Mercier Press. 3s. 6d.)

THE Mercier Press has published a series of small handbooks which provide a simple course in philosophy to meet the requirements of those who, while lacking what might be described as a professional interest in the subject, yet wish to learn something of the outlines, at least, of Christian philosophy. At present four of these handbooks have appeared, attractively presented and reasonably priced, dealing with Logic, Epistemology, Psychology and Cosmology. *Cosmology for All*, the latest in the series, is a work most ably written by a distinguished Franciscan scholar who now lectures in philosophy at University College, Galway, and whose qualifications include that of the doctorate in philosophy of the *Institut Supérieur* of Louvain. This work meets a real need, for if scholastic handbooks in the English language are relatively few in comparison with the vast number of non-scholastic works that are available, the shortage of Cosmological studies is particularly unfortunate at the present time. Fr Rabbitte is at pains to point out that his book is not intended for use as a textbook but instead is meant to encourage its readers to embark for themselves upon a more serious study of this much-neglected branch of philosophy. Despite this protestation, a careful reading suggests that, as with the companion volume in the series, *Epistemology for All*, Fr Rabbitte's book can be recommended not only to the general reader for whom it is expressly designed, but also to the seminary student about to make the acquaintance of Cosmology and to the priest who desires to brush the dust off his memories of that subject. The author makes no claim to originality of thought, and indeed some of the most important sections of the book have been drawn, with due acknowledgement, from Professor Renoirte's well-known *Critique des Sciences et de Cosmologie*. It is seldom that one finds the difficult questions that arise in the philosophical interpretation of the material universe treated with such conciseness and clarity, and the book might well be given to the prospective convert who has dabbled with modern scientific theories.

J. MOLLOY

The Shroud of Turin. By Werner Bulst, S.J. Translated by Stephen McKenna, C.S.S.R., and James J. Galvin, C.S.S.R. Pp. xviii + 167, followed by 16 pp. of photographs and two large photographs in back pocket. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. \$4.75.)

OF recent years there has been a great increase of interest in the Holy Shroud of Turin, and there will be a welcome for this book among the large numbers who want to know all the facts about this remarkable object of veneration. Fr Bulst joins the throng of those who hold that the Shroud of Turin is indeed the shroud or winding-cloth in which our Lord was buried. But, while he is quite openly a defender of the authenticity of the Shroud, the author's purpose in this book is to tell us all about the history of the Shroud and everything that has been done or said to prove either its authenticity or spuriousness. It is difficult to believe that Fr Bulst has omitted anything, but the very completeness of his work is quite overwhelming in its detail. The most important chapters are "History of the Shroud" (pp. 6-18), "The Problem of the Fabric" (pp. 28-30), "Conclusions from Artistic Technique and Style" (pp. 31-43), "Medical Investigation of the Shroud of Turin" (pp. 53-72), and "Exegetical and Archaeological Investigations into the Burial of Jesus" (pp. 77-101). The text is followed by thirty-four pages of notes, references to which are given in the text. There are then nine pages of bibliography, divided into periods, and the works for and against authenticity are listed separately. The book concludes with sixteen pages of excellent photographs and diagrams and two photographs, negative and positive, 22½ in. by 5½ in., are contained in a pocket attached to the back cover. The Shroud itself is a *negative* image. Whatever view one may take, we must be grateful to Fr Bulst for making all this material available to us. Even those who deny the authenticity of the Shroud or feel doubtful about it, will nevertheless revere it as an image of venerable antiquity since its *known* history goes back certainly to the middle of the fourteenth century.

A. B.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

men
+
to-
ee.

the
book
his
ose
ng-
y a
e in
ery-
or
ny-
ing
the
(30),
(43),
and
l of
s of
nine
and
with
oto-
in a
ative
gult
the
eless
tory

ed for
.I, in